THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

620043

FC

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES,

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

28° & 29° VICTORIÆ, 1865.

VOL. CLXXX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWELFTH DAY OF JUNE 1865,

TO

THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY 1865.

Fourth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
23, PATERNOSTER ROW [E.C.]

1865

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXX.

THIRD SERIES.

---

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 12.

UNITED STATES—BELLIGERENT RIGHTS—Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell 1

Locomotives on Roads Bill (No. 108)—

On Motion of *The Earl of Carnarvon*, List of the Committee named:—

D. Richmond, D. Sutherland, M. Salisbury, E. Caithness, E. Hardwicke, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, V. Melville, V. Eversley, L. Silchester, L. Rossie, L. Stanley of Alderley .. 7

And on *Tuesday*, June 13, Lord Harris *added* in the Place of Duke of Sutherland, Earl De Grey in the Place of Lord Stanley of Alderley, and Earl Ducie, Viscount Strathallan, Lord Calthorpe, and Lord Wenlock *added*.

Also on June 14 the Earl of Malmesbury *added*.

Union Chargeability Bill (No. 122)—

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a,—(*The Lord President*) 9

Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("be") to the end of the Motion, and insert ("referred to a Select Committee,")—(*The Duke of Rutland.*)

Question proposed, "Whether the Bill be referred to a Select Committee."

After long debate their Lordships *divided*; Contents 24, Not-Contents 86; Majority 62:—List of the Contents and Not-Contents 41

Resolved in the *Negative*.

Then the original Motion was *agreed to*.

Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 12.

Westminster Improvements Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—

Bill read 2°; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed" 43

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words "to a Select Committee, half the Members to be named by the House, and half by the Committee of Selection:"—(*Mr. Augustus Smith:*)—Question proposed, "That those words be there added" 44

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—*Ordered*, That the Bill be committed.

THE SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY AND THE CIVIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 45

CUSTOM HOUSE CHARGES—Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 45

WEST INDIES POSTAGE RATES—Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 46

Roman Catholic Oath Bill [Bill 86]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 46
Bill *reported* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Thursday.*

Record of Title (Ireland) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 151]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 86
Committee report Progress, to sit again on *Thursday.*

Poor Law Board Continuance, &c., Bill [Bill 197]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. C. P. Villiers*) 89
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Packe*) 100
After debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" — The House *divided;* Ayes 76, Noes 69; Majority 7.
Main Question put, and *agreed to* :—Bill read 2°; and *committed.*

Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill [Bill 178]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* :—Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow* .. 104

SUPPLY—Resolutions [June 8] *reported* and *agreed to.*
Special Mission, Reply of Mr. Layard 106

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance—
Moved, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue and amend The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856,—(*Sir Robert Peel.*) On Motion of *Mr. Hennessy,* after short debate, adjourned till *To-morrow* .. 106

Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit Bill—
On Motion of (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel*)—*ordered;* read 1° [Bill 208] 107

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 13.

Railway Passengers Bill (No. 149)—
Observations, The Earl of Dartmouth; Reply, Lord St. Leonards .. 107
After short debate thereon, Bill for the better Security of Railway Passengers, *presented* by The Lord St. Leonards; read 1ª. (No. 149) .. 107

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES—
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to congratulate Her Majesty on the Princess of Wales having happily given birth to another Prince, and to assure Her Majesty of the deep Interest felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the Domestic Happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family,"—(*The Lord President*) ... 109
After short debate, Motion *agreed to, Nemine Dissentiente.*

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA — Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, Earl Russell 109

Public-house Closing Act (1864) Amendment Bill (No. 126)—
Moved, That the House be now put into Committee on the said Bill,—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) 112
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—House in Committee accordingly .. 114
Report thereof to be received on *Tuesday* next. To be *printed* as amended (No. 151.)

Partnership Amendment Bill (No. 123)—
Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª,—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 116
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY—Petition *presented* by Lord Brougham .. 122

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 13.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

Prisons Bill [Bill 141]—
After short debate, Bill read 3°, and *passed* 123

Greenwich Hospital (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 179]—
Bill *considered* in Committee :—Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Thursday.* 124

The Police at Public Buildings—Question, Lord Robert Montagu ; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring 131

United States—Case of the "Saxon"—Mrs. Gray—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard 131

The Paper Trade — Question, Mr. Aspinall Turner ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 131

Docks at Bermuda—Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Lord C. Paget.. 132

Metropolitan Paving, &c.—
Moved, To appoint a Commission to inquire into the operation of the Act 18 and 19 Vict. cap. 120, so far as the same relates to the Paving, Lighting, and Cleansing of the Metropolis,—(*Sir William Fraser*) 132
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Ireland—Belfast Riots—
Moved, That an inquiry be made in certain charges seriously impugning the official conduct of certain magistrates named therein, that equity to the magistrates so accused, and a due regard to the vindication of the impartiality of the administration of justice, require that a full inquiry into the truth of these charges should be instituted by the authorities intrusted with the supervision of the magistracy of Ireland,"—(*Mr. O'Reilly*) .. 140
Question put :—The House *divided ;* Ayes 39, Noes 132 ; Majority 93.

Harbours of Refuge—Resolution
Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Ministers should now adopt measures for the construction of some of the Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Great Britain and Ireland, recommended by a Committee of this House in 1858, and by a Royal Commission in 1859,"—(*Sir Frederic Smith*) 164
After long debate, Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 99, Noes 111 ; Majority 12.

Theatres, &c., Bill [Bill 64]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Locke*) 178
Amendment proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)
After short debate, Question, "That the debate be now adjourned," put, and *agreed to.*
Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 165]—
Order for Committee read 183
After short debate, Committee *deferred* till *Thursday.*

Expiring Laws—
Select Committee *appointed* and *nominated** as follows :—
Mr. Peel, Mr. Dodson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Cowper, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel French, Mr. Baring, Mr. Brand, Mr. Dunlop, and Lord John Manners 183

Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) Bill—(*Mr. Baring*)—*ordered;* read 1°* [Bill 209] 184

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation—
Considered in Committee :—*ordered;* read 1° * [Bill 210] 184

Ulster Canal Transfer Bill—(*Mr. Peel*)—*ordered;* read 1° [Bill 211] .. 184

Fortifications and Works—Committee—
Considered in Committee :—Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow* .. 184

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14.

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill [Bill 85]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Goschen*) 185
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months," —(*Lord Robert Cecil*) 210
After long debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 206, Noes 190; Majority 16:—List of the Ayes and Noes 247
Main Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put and *agreed to:*—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Wednesday* next.

Princess of Wales—Answer to Address [8th June] *reported* .. 250

Fortifications and Works Bill—
Resolutions [June 13] *reported:*—Bill *ordered;* read 1° [Bill 215] 250

Harbours Transfer Bill—(*Mr. Milner Gibson*)—*ordered; presented;* read 1° [Bill 216] .. 250

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 15.

Courts of Justice Building Bill—
Petition of Etheldreda Browning *presented*—(*Lord Stratford de Redcliffe*) .. 251

Partnership Amendment Bill (No. 123)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 252
The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 162.)

Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) Bill (No. 144)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 253
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly and *committed;* the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Mortgage Debentures Bill (No. 107)—
Referred to a Select Committee and *nominated* * as follows:—
The Lord Chancellor, Duke of Marlborough, Marquess of Salisbury, Marquess of Bath, Earl of Malmesbury, Viscount Hutchinson, Lord Boyle, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Cranworth, Lord Saint Leonards, and Lord Chelmsford 256

Land Debentures (Ireland) Bill (No. 113)—
On Motion of *The Earl of Cork*, Bill *referred* to the Mortgage Debentures Bill Committee 256

Land Debentures Bill (No. 112)—
Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and *referred* to the Mortgage Debentures Bill Committee 256

Locomotives on Roads Bill (No. 108)—
The Earl of Malmesbury added to the Select Committee on the Bill .. 256

Metalliferous Mines (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—Was *presented* by the Lord Rosse; read 1ª* (No. 109) 258

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 15.

Committee of Selection—Special Report 259
India—Army Promotion—Question, Mr. Cobbold; Answer, Sir C. Wood .. 259
The Indian Budget — Questions, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Arthur Mills, and Mr. Ayrton; Answers, Sir Charles Wood 260

MILEAGE DUTIES ON STAGE CARRIAGES—Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 261

THE SILVER COINAGE—Question, Mr. J. C. Ewart; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 261

RAILWAY TRAVELLING—Question, Colonel Greville; Answer, Mr. M. Gibson 262

VACANT INSPECTORSHIP OF CHARITIES—Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce 263

ANGLO-AUSTRIAN COMMERCIAL TREATY—Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Layard 264

Malt Duty Bill [Bill 160]—

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*) 264

After long debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 278

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

Sugar Duties and Drawbacks Bill [Bill 198]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 280

Bill *reported* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit Bill [Bill 208]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 284

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Lord Robert Montagu*) 296

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*. Main Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put, and *agreed to*:— Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

Inland Revenue (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 207]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 304

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

Law of Evidence, &c., Bill [Bill 20]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 308

[No Report.]

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance—

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [12th June], "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue and amend 'The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856,'"—(*Sir Robert Peel*) 319

Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed.*

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 135, Noes 43; Majority 92:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey, and Mr. Luke White.

Roman Catholic Oath Bill [Bill 86]—

Moved, That the Bill be now read a third time,—(*Mr. Monsell*) .. 325

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

Record of Titles Ireland Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 151]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 330

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 217.]

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE—
Considered in Committee 331
Resolutions of Lord Clarence Paget and The Marquess of Hartington *agreed to.*
Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Theatres, &c., Bill [Bill 64]—
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [13th June] read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Debate be further adjourned till Monday next 332

After short debate, Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present, House *adjourned.*

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 16.

EXHIBITION OF MINIATURES AT KENSINGTON—Question, Earl Stanhope; Answer, Earl Granville 332

THE SLAVE TRADE PAPERS—Question, Lord Brougham; Answer, Earl Granville 333

CHURCH SERVICES AT ST. ALBAN'S—CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND—LAW OF EVIDENCE—Observations, The Marquess of Westmeath:—Long Debate thereon 334

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE—STANDING ORDER NO. 25—NEW STANDING ORDERS—
Moved, That the Resolutions of the 10th of March, 1857, regulating the mode of taking Divisions, be now vacated:—(*The Duke of Richmond:*)—The same was *agreed to*:—New Standing Orders *agreed to* 347

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FISHERIES' COMMISSIONERS—Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Granville 349

Union Chargeability Bill (No. 122)—
Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill,—(*The Lord President*).. 351
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—House in Committee accordingly:—Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 171.)

Courts of Justice Concentration (Site) Bill (No. 141)—
Commons Amendment to Lords Amendment *considered* .. 357
After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Courts of Justice Building Bill (No. 23)—
Commons Reasons for disagreeing to Lords' Amendment *considered* .. 359
After short debate, on Question whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 16.

South Kensington New Road Bill—
Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the South Kensington New Road Bill be re-committed to the former Committee, and that they do proceed therewith upon Monday next,"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour*) 360
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment (*re-committed* **Bill** [Bill 187]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 363
Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* on *Tuesday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 220.]

OWNERLESS DOGS—Question, Mr. Dawson Damer; Answer, Sir G. Grey .. 365

ARMY—REGIMENTAL PAYMASTERS—Question, Mr. H. E. Surtees; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 366

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

ARMY—THE ARMSTRONG AND WHITWORTH GUNS—Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 366

DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Robert Peel 367

UNITED STATES—CONSULS FOR THE SOUTHERN STATES—Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Layard 367

IRISH RECORDS—Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 368

ARMY—THE ARMSTRONG GUN COMMISSION—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 368

THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY—Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Sir George Grey 369

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

DOCKYARD SUPERINTENDENTS—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to continue the practice of appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years,"—(*Mr. Seely*,)—instead thereof 369

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 34, Noes 36; Majority 2.

After further short debate, Question again put,

That the words 'in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to continue the practice of appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years,' be added,—instead thereof 389

The House *divided;* Ayes 33, Noes 60; Majority 27.

THE ORDER OF THE BATH—Amendment proposed for an Address for Copy of Regulations 400

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

FORMS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. W. O. Stanley:—Debate thereon .. 409

THE SOULAGE COLLECTION—Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "There be laid before this House, Copies of Correspondence relating to the purchase of the Soulage Collection for the South Kensington Museum,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn*) 410

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE BALLOT—Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "As a General Election is impending, and as we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters nor prevent Bribery, it is therefore expedient that a trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot,"—(*Mr. Henry Berkeley*) 416

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 74, Noes 118; Majority 44.

Another Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "This House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Supply,"—(*Viscount Palmerston*) 427

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Words *added:*—Original Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Penalties Law Amendment Bill [Bill 213]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir George Grey*) 428
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 3° accordingly, and *passed.*

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment Bill—*presented;* read 1°* [Bill 219] 428

Colonial Docks Loans—
Resolution [June 15] *reported* :—Bill *ordered; presented;* read 1°* [Bill 226] .. 428

Carriers Act Amendment Bill—
Considered in Committee :—Bill *ordered; presented;* read 1°* [Bill 224] .. 428

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill—(*Mr. Baring*)—*ordered; presented;* read 1°* [Bill 227] 428

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill—(*Mr. Baring*)—*ordered; presented;* read 1°* [Bill 225] 429

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 19.

Statute Law Revision Bill—
Was presented by (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 172) .. 430

Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales—
Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, *reported* 430

The Slave Trade—Observations, Lord Brougham; Reply, Earl Russell .. 431

Irish Poor Law Unions—Petition *presented* by the Earl of Granard .. 431
After short debate, Petition to lie on the table.

Railway Passengers Bill (No. 149)—
Order of the Day for the Second Reading *discharged;* and Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn* 432

Singapore and the Straits Settlements—Question, The Earl of Albemarle; Answer, Earl Granville 437

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 19.

British North America—The Confederation—Observations, Mr. Cardwell 439
Papers relating to the late Conferences *presented* [by Command]; to lie on the Table.—*Parl. P.* No. [3426.]

Endowed Grammar Schools—Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce 440

Treasure Trove—Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Peel .. 440

Army—Employment of Dr. Sutherland—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 441

India—Dhar Prize Money—Question, Mr. H. Lewis; Answer, Sir C. Wood 442

The Savings Banks and the National Debt—Question, Mr. Henley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 442

Bishops' Trust Substitution Act — Question, Mr. Mundy; Answer, Mr. Walpole 444

Forfeiture for Treason and Felony Bill—Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General 445

Stamp Duty on Highway Contracts—Question, Mr. Trefusis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 446

The German Zollverein—Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Layard .. 446

Companies Workmen's Education Bill—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley :—Order for Second Reading of the Bill *discharged* :—Bill *withdrawn* 446

India—Land Tenure in Oude—Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir C. Wood 447

Lahore Bishopric Bill—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir C. Wood 447
And Order for Second Reading of the Bill *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Patent Laws—Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Lord Stanley 448

Special Missions — Viscount Amberley's Travelling Expenses — Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. Layard 449

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:" —

The Secretary of State for War—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it would be convenient, under present circumstances, that the Secretary of State for War should be a Member of the House of Commons,"—(*Mr. Darby Griffith,*)—instead thereof 450

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Publication of Irish Records—

Moved, "That it is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken for their publication as has been for the publication of the Records of England and Scotland,"—(*Colonel Dunne*) 457

The Treaty with the Zollverein—Observations, Mr. Hubbard; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson 461

Ireland—Case of Patrick Donohue—Motion for Papers (*Mr. O'Reilly*) .. 467
Debate thereon.

Sheerness Dockyard—Question, Sir Edward Dering; Answer, Lord C. Paget 469

Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—Post Office Packet Service—*considered* in Committee.

(6.) Question again proposed, £841,867, for the Post Office Packet Service .. 471
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Class II.—Civil Service Estimates.

(7.) Question again proposed, £20,482, to complete the sum for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues 478
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Vote *agreed to.*

Supplementary Estimate. Class I, Vote 27.

(8.) £10,000, Works at Landguard Point.

Supplementary Estimate. Class 1, Vote 28.

(9.) £20,000, National Gallery Enlargement:—After long debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 484

Supplementary Estimates.

(10.) £700,000, New Courts of Justice and Offices.

Navy—No. 18.

(11.) £63,915, Greenwich Hospital.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Greenwich Hospital Bill [Bill 212]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 499
Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment Bill [Bill 219]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Robert Peel*) 508
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Maguire.*)

Peace Preservation Ireland Act (1856) Amendment Bill—continued.

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After further short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 76, Noes 29; Majority 47.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill [Bill 133]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 512

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 513

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Sugar Duties and Drawbacks Bill [Bill 198]—

Order for Third Reading read and *discharged:*—Bill *re-committed:*—*Considered* in Committee 514

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered:*—Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions)—

The Sergeant at Arms informed the House, that George Morris Mitchell had been this day apprehended, and was now in Newgate .. 514

A Petition of George Morris Mitchell, a State Prisoner in Her Majesty's Gaol of Newgate, expressing his deep contrition and regret if he has offended against the dignity of the House, and praying for his release from custody, *brought up,* and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be *printed.* [App. 2.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 20.

Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment Bill (No. 151)—

Amendment *reported* (according to Order) 515

Moved, To re-insert Clause 5—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*).

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Clause re-inserted.

Bill to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next; and to be printed, as amended. (No. 192.)

Prisons Bill (No. 155)—

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª,—(*The Lord President*) .. 518

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Land Debentures (Ireland) Bill (No. 113)—

Moved, That the Bill be *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House,—(*The Earl of Cork*) 522

After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 51, Not-Contents 14; Majority 37:—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative:*—List of Contents and Not-Contents 523

House in Committee accordingly:—Amendments made:—The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next, and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 193.)

Union Chargeability Bill (No. 171)—

Bill read 3ª (according to Order) with the Amendments 524

After short debate, Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 20.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries)—*Considered* in Committee 527

Resolution *moved,*

That provision be made for the payment out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland of the sum of Three Hundred Pounds per annum to each of the Judges of the County Courts, in addition to their present salary,—(*Mr. Peel.*)

Motion *agreed to:*—Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

Fire Brigrade (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 153]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 529
Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Thursday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 230.]

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 165]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [Progress 19th June] 534
Bill *reported;* to be *printed,* as amended [Bill 231]; *re-committed* for *Monday* next.

Reviews of the Militia—Question, Lord Burghley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 538

Army—Recruiting—Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 539

Italy—Capture of English Subjects by Brigands—Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr. Layard 539

China—Foreign Vessels under the Chinese Flag—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Layard 539

Master Manufacturers — Rental on Machinery — Question, Sir Robert Clifton; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 540

The Argentine Republic—Treatment of a British Officer—Question, Admiral Walcott; Answer, Mr. Layard 540

University Education (Ireland)—Motion for an Address—
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system of University Education in Ireland prevent a large number of Her Majesty's Subjects from enjoying the advantages of University Education, and praying that such steps may be taken as will remove this grievance,"—(*The O'Donoghue*) 541
After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Secret Service Money—Motion for a "Return of the sums which have been paid out of the Secret Service Money by the Treasury," &c.—(*Mr. Darby Griffith*) 590
After short debate, Question put: — The House *divided;* Ayes 18, Noes 45; Majority 27.

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill [Bill 220]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 592
Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

Turnpike Tolls Abolition Bill [Bill 128]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Whalley*) 592
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Order for Second Reading read and *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment Bill [Bill 37]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Whalley*) 593
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Order for Second Reading read and *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment Bill [Bill 219]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." 594
After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*
Bill *considered* in Committee
Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° *To-morrow,*

Colonial Docks Loans Bill [Bill 226]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the second time,"—(*Lord Clarence Paget*) 595

After short debate, Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Ways and Means—Order for Committee read.

Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented 8th June] *referred.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*Considered* in Committee * 596

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved,* That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there be issued and applied to the service of the year ending the 31st day of March, 1866, the sum of £1,318,526 16*s.* 9*d.*, being the Surplus of Ways and Means granted for the service of preceding years.
2. That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the sum of £23,342,558 3*s.* 3*d.*, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Excise Acts—*Considered* in Committee 596

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

Bank Notes Issue (Scotland)—*Considered* in Committee :*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Blackburn Mr. Stirling*) 596

Compound Spirits Warehousing—*Considered* in Committee : *—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*) 596

Inns of Court (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 192]—

Order for Committee read ; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 597

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present ; House counted, and 40 Members not being present, House adjourned.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21.

Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill [Bill 54]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Blake*) 597

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Merchant Shipping Disputes Bill [Bill 90]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Denman*) 599

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn :*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Bank Notes (Ireland) Bill [Bill 124]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) 604

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn :*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Educational and Charitable Institutions Bill [Bill 97]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Lygon*) 608

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Remington Mills*) :—Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question" 611

After short debate, Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 49, Noes 35 ; Majority 14.

Main Question put, and *agreed to :*—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for this day three months.

Railways Clauses (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 170]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 616
Amendment proposed, To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Bass,*)—instead thereof 618
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."
After debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Bill *withdrawn.*

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill [Bill 220]—
Order for Third Reading read 624
After short debate, Bill read 3° and *passed.*

Indemnity Bill—
Bill to indemnify such persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and to extend the time limited for those purposes respectively, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer. 624
After short debate, Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 234.]

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill — *ordered*—(*Mr. Dodson, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)—*presented,* and read 1°*.

Expiring Laws Continuance — *ordered* — (*Mr. Peel, Chancellor of the Exchequer*)—*presented,* and read 1°*. [Bill 235.]

Compound Spirits Warehousing Bill—*presented,* and read 1°*. [Bill 233.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 22.

Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment Bill [Bill 61]—
Bill *considered* in Committee (according to Order) 626
Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 205.)

Rentcharges (Ireland) Revision Bill [H.L.]—Was *presented* by The Lord Somerhill, read 1ª*. (No. 203.)

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 22.

The Paymaster General and the Audit Office—Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 627

Navy—Loss of the "Bombay"—Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 629

Episcopal Residence at Bristol—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir George Grey 632

The Thames Embankment—Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. M. Gibson .. 633

Saturday Half-Holiday in Government Offices—Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 633

Clerical Subscription Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 199]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir George Grey*) 634
After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read 2°, and *committed* for Monday next.

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill [Bill 133]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 663
Bill *reported*; as amended, to be *considered To-morrow.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time," 670
After debate, Question put, and *agreed to*;—Bill read 2° and *committed* for *To-morrow,*

County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 150]—
Order for Committee read.
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to assimilate the Sheriffs' Court of the City of London in all respects to a County Court,"—(*Mr. Ayrton*) ... 679
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Bill *considered* in Committee 681
Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed*. [Bill 236.]

Indemnity Bill [Bill 234]—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Peel*) 684
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Hadfield.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."
After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 32, Noes 18; Majority 14.
Main Question put, and *agreed to:* — Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill [Bill 227]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 687
And it appearing that 40 Members were not present:—Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:—House counted, and 40 Members not being present, House adjourned.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 23.

THE CONSUL AT SARAWAK—Question, Viscount Stratford De Redcliffe; Answer, Earl Russell 690

STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUSINESS — Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley:—Debate thereon 691

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE—Petition *presented* by Lord Lyttelton .. 696
After debate, Petition read and ordered to lie on the table.

CHARITIES OF THE CITIES OF LONDON AND WESTMINSTER—
Moved, "That the Digest of the Parochial Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster, referred to in the Eleventh and Twelfth Reports of the Charity Commissioners, be laid before the House,"—(*The Bishop of London*) 705
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:—Parl. Paper* [No. 3461]

THE BURIAL SERVICE—Question, Lord Ebury; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury 707

Partnership Amendment Bill (No. 162)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 709
Amendments *moved* and *negatived;* an Amendment made; and Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

Rochdale Vicarage Bill [H.L.]—Was *presented* by the Earl of Chichester; read 1ª.* (No. 213.)

Naval Discipline Act Amendment Bill [H.L.] — Was *presented* by The Duke of Somerset; read 1ª.* (No. 214.)

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 23.

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill—
Bill *considered* in Committee 717
Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

Fire Brigade Metropolis Bill [Bill 230]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 718
Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow*.

Poor Law Board Continuance &c., (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 218]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"— 719

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the provisions of this Bill should be limited to the continuance of the Poor Law Board for one year,"—(*Lord Fermoy,*)—instead thereof 720

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn* :—Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee :—Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed* [Bill 238]

Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland) — Report *brought up* :—After short debate, Report read; to lie upon the table, and to be *printed* [No. 402] 730

India—Lucknow Prize Money, Question, Sir Minto Farquhar ; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 730

Army—Dress of Military Chaplains, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 731

Indian Finances—Question, Mr. Vansittart ; Answer, Sir Charles Wood .. 731

Navy—Assistant Surgeons—Question, Sir John Pakington ; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget 732

Adjournment of the House—

Moved, That the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday next.

Chain Cables and Anchors—Observations, Mr. Laird ; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson :—Short debate thereon 732

The Naval Reserves—Observations, Mr. Corry ; Reply, Lord C. Paget .. 738

India — Claims of the Satpoora and Goa Frontier Field Forces — Observations, Mr. Staniland ; Reply, Mr. T. G. Baring 748

Navy—Dockyard Superintendents—Question, Sir Frederic Smith ; Answer, Mr. Childers 751

Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland)—Observations, Mr. Hennessy : —Debate thereon 752

Motion *agreed to* :—House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 23—*continued*

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill [Bill 133]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 760

After short debate, Bill to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

LORDS, SATURDAY, JUNE 24.

Private Bills—Standing Order No. 179. Sect. 1. *considered* (according to Order) 761

Their Lordships having then gone through the Business on the Paper without debate, House adjourned.

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 26.

Divine Worship in the Church of England Bill—

A Bill to amend the Law relating to the Performance of Divine Worship in the Church of England—Was *presented* by the Marquess of Westmeath ; read 1ª. (No. 218.) 762

State of Public and Private Business—Observations, Lord Redesdale:—Short debate thereon 763

Private Bills—Standing Orders 184 and 185 *considered* (according to Order), and amended 764

Roman Catholic Oath Bill (No. 170)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 764

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months,")—(*The Earl of Derby*) 772

After long debate, on Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 63, Not-Contents 84; Majority 21:—

List of Contents and Not-Contents. 821

Resolved in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read 2° on *this Day Three Months.*

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 26.

Government Annuities—27 & 28 Vict. c. 43.—Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 823

Poor Law—The Highworth Union—Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Viscount Enfield 824

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill—

Order for Third Reading read. 825

After short debate, Bill read 3ª and *passed.*

Clerical Subscription Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 199]—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill" 837

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee:—Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow* 839

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill [Bill 133]—

Order for Third Reading read 841

After short debate, Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill [Bill 227]—

Bill *considered* in Committee:—Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow* 844

County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 236]—

Bill, as amended, *considered:*—Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.* .. 847

Railway Debentures, &c., Registry Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 241]—

Order for Second Reading read 848

After short debate, Second Reading *put off* for a fortnight.

Tyne Improvement Bill—

Petitions *presented* by The Earl of Ellenborough 848

Short debate thereon:—Bill read 3ª.

The Dissolution of the Parliament—Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, Lord Redesdale 850

Private Bills—

Standing Order No. 179, Sect. 1, *considered* (according to Order) .. 852

Resolution (*The Chairman of Committees*) *agreed to.*

Private Bills—Standing Order No. 178, Sect. 9, *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with* for the Remainder of the Session,—(*The Chairman of Committees*) 853

Divisions of the House—
Standing Order No. 25, Sect. 2, *considered* (according to Order), and amended,—(*The Chairman of Committees*) 853

Prisons Bill (No. 155)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 853
Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 228.)

Greenwich Hospital Bill (No. 179)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Duke of Somerset*) .. 855
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill (No. 199)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 857
Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 229.)

Roman Catholic Schools—Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville 859

Liverpool Borough Prison—Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville 859

Hymn Book for the Army and Navy—Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon 859

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 27.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Private Bills—Court of Referees on—
Standing Order 88 read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Standing Order be repealed,"—(*Colonel Wilson Patten*) 861
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned," —(*Mr. Milner Gibson*):—Motion and Original Question, by leave, *withdrawn* 874
Standing Orders 89, 90, 91, and 149 read, and amended.
Ordered, That the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, as amended, be *printed*. [*Parl. Paper*, No. 420.]

Clerical Subscription Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 199]—
Bill, as amended, *considered*:—Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow* 879

Leeds Bankruptcy Court—Observations, Mr. Longfield; Reply, The Attorney General:—Long debate thereon 879
Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn," —(*Mr. Longfield*,)—put, and *negatived* 893

Prorogation of the Parliament — Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, Viscount Palmerston 914

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper without debate, House adjourned.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28.

Capital Punishments Within Gaols Bill [Bill 30]—
Order for Second Reading read:—Order *discharged*:—Bill *withdrawn* .. 915

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 29.

DIVISIONS OF THIS HOUSE—
Standing Order No. 39 *considered* (according to Order), and amended .. 917

PRIVATE BILLS—Standing Order No. 184, Sect. 2 *considered* (according to Order), and amended 917

PRIVATE BILLS—STANDING ORDERS DISPENSED WITH—
The Standing Orders of the House *considered* (according to Order) .. 917
Moved, That the Standing Orders of the House be *dispensed with* in relation to Private Bills for the Remainder of the Session,—(*The Chairman of Committees*):—Motion *agreed to*.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Resolution of Lord Redesdale relating thereto .. 918

Divine Worship in the Church of England Bill (No. 218)
On Motion of *The Marquess of Westmeath*, after short debate, Order for Second Reading *discharged*:—Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn* .. 918

Poor Law Board Continuance Bill (No. 227)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl de Grey*) .. 919
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

Prisons Bill (No. 228)—
Amendments reported (according to Order) 921
After short debate, further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*.

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment Bill (No. 200)—
Moved, That the House be now put into a Committee on the said Bill,—(*The Lord Steward*) 921
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—House in Committee (according to Order):—Report to be received *To-morrow*.

Clerical Subscription Bill [H.L.] (No. 230)—
Commons Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 924

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 29.

INDIA—MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir C. Wood .. 924

HOME GROWN TOBACCO—Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 925

BRITISH INDIA AND COLONIAL TRUST AND AGENCY CORPORATION (LIMITED)—Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson 925

INDIA—GRIEVANCES OF INDIAN OFFICERS—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood 926

IRELAND—THE RAILWAY SYSTEM—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 927

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Cardwell .. 927

INDIA—EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS)—
Considered in Committee 927
Resolutions relating to the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments, the several Presidencies, the North Western Provinces, and the Punjaub—(*Sir Charles Wood.*)
Resolutions *agreed to*:—To be reported *To-morrow*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

3 *Hansard*, vol. 180

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 30.

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill (No. 225)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*Earl de Grey and Ripon*) .. 964
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

Penalties Law Amendment Bill (No. 178)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 968
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC MUSEUMS, &c.—
Petitions for Opening in Evenings *presented* by Lord Ebury 969

ISSUE OF ARMY COMMISSIONS—Question, The Earl of Longford; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon 971

CLAIMS OF MR. JACKSON—Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Russell 974

CAPTAINS ON THE RESERVED LIST—Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, The Duke of Somerset 975

WARRANT OFFICERS—Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset 980

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 30.

PRIVATE BUSINESS—Resolutions relating to Standing Orders *considered* ... 981

FARM BUILDINGS AND COTTAGES IN SCOTLAND—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir George Grey 982

LAW OF SIMONY—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Attorney General 982

ARMY—MACKAY'S GUN—Question, Mr. J. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 983

MASTERS IN THE NAVY—Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Mr. Childers .. 983

ARMY—FIELD ALLOWANCE TO OFFICERS AT ALDERSHOT—Question, Major Knox; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 984

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—
Moved, That the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday next.

MINOR CANONS, &c.—Observations, Mr. C. Bentinck; Reply, Sir G. Grey .. 984

ARMY—SALARY OF DR. SUTHERLAND—Question, Colonel Herbert; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 989

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA—Observations, Sir Hugh Cairns; Reply, Mr. Layard:—Long debate thereon 992

THE DYCE SOMBRE CASE—Observations, Mr. Hennessy; Reply, The Attorney General 1016

TRANSPORT SERVICE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND INDIA—Observation, Mr. Ayrton; Reply, Mr. T. G. Baring 1022

Motion *agreed to*:—House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

INDIA—EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS)—
Resolutions [June 29] *reported* and *agreed to* 1024

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 3.

SLAVERY—Personal Explanation, Lord Brougham 1025

STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUSINESS—Observations, Lord Redesdale and Earl Granville 1026

CHURCH OF ENGLAND BURIAL SERVICE—

Moved to Resolve, That, in the opinion of this House, the Evils arising from the compulsory and almost indiscriminate use of the Burial Service of the Church of England demand the early Attention of the Legislature,—(*The Lord Ebury*) 1026

On Question? Their Lordships *divided;* Contents 20, Not-Contents 43; Majority 23:—*Resolved* in the *Negative:*—List of the Contents and Not-Contents 1033

COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS—

On the Motion of Earl Cowper, amended by Lord Redesdale, after short debate, Resolutions *agreed to* 1033

Ordered, That there be laid upon the Table a List of those Lords who have served on Private Bill Committees during the present Session of Parliament; and the Number of Times that each Lord has served; and the number of Days he sat on every such Committee,—(*The Earl Cowper*)

TITLES TO LAND IN INDIA—Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Lord Dufferin 1038

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 3.

STANDING ORDERS—Standing Order No. 60 rescinded, and new Standing Order substituted 1040

MR. WINSLOW'S PENSION—Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, The Attorney General 1040

IRELAND—THE DINNER TO MR. GAVAN DUFFY—Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Sir Robert Peel 1041

IRELAND—THE LAW ADVISER TO THE CASTLE—Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Sir Robert Peel 1042

THE GRAND JUNCTION CANAL BASIN—Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce 1043

CONVENTION OF FOREIGN LAW—Question, Mr. J. J. Powell; Answer, Mr. Layard 1044

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey 1044

LEEDS BANKRUPTCY COURT, &c.—

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the evidence taken before the Committee of this House, on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, discloses that a great facility exists for obtaining Public Appointments by corrupt means; and that such Evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the House of Lords in the case of Leonard Edmunds, and laid before this House, shows a laxity of Practice and want of caution on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to Public Officers over whose heads grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such Officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices; and that such laxity and want of caution, even in the absence of any improper motive, are, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible, and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the High Offices of State,"—(*Mr. Hunt*) 1045

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out from the first word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House having considered the Report of the Select Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the evidence taken by it, agrees with the Committee in the opinion that the facts which are established acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge in the matters to which it refers, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde; but this House is of opinion that some further check should be placed by Law upon the grant of pensions to the holders of legal offices,"—(*The Lord Advocate,*)—instead thereof 1072

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

LEEDS BANKRUPTCY COURT, &c.—*continued.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Viscount Palmerston*) 1134

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 163, Noes 177; Majority 14. List of the Ayes and Noes 1136

Question, "That those words be there added,"—(*The Lord Advocate,*)—put, and *negatived.* .. ..

Another Amendment proposed,

To add, after the first word "That, in the original Question, the words "This House, having considered the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the Evidence taken before them, are of opinion, that, while the Evidence discloses the existence of corrupt practices, with reference to the appointment of Patrick Robert Welch to the office of Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, they are satisfied that no imputation can fairly be made against the Lord Chancellor, with regard to this appointment; and that such evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the Lords to inquire into the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Edmunds of the offices held by him, and laid before this House, show a laxity of practice and a want of caution with regard to the public interests, on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of Retiring Pensionsto Public Officers against whom grave charges were pending, which, in the opinion of this House, are calculated to discredit the administration of his great office,"—(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*) .. 1135

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 4.

Page

PENSION TO MR. WINSLOW, LATE MASTER IN LUNACY—Personal Explanation, Lord Chelmsford 1139

RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR—Observations, Earl Granville .. 1142

UNITED STATES—CLOSE OF THE CIVIL WAR — Copy of Papers laid on the Table 1143

Penalties Law Amendment Bill (No. 248)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order):—Short debate thereon .. 1143

Standing Orders No. 37 and 38 *considered* and *dispensed* with.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 3ª,—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) .. 1144

An Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months:")—(*Lord Denman:*)—On Question, That "now" stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 22, Not-Contents 14; Majority 8:—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative*:—Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons:—List of Contents and Not-Contents .. 1144

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA — Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, Earl Russell 1145

CASE OF CATHERINE GAUGHAN—Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville 1158

THE INDIAN ARMY—Question, The Earl of Longford; Answer, Lord Dufferin 1159

THE CHURCH IN IRELAND—THE TWENTY-NINTH CANON of 1603 — Question, The Archbishop of Dublin; Answer, Earl Granville 1160

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 4.

STANDING ORDERS—Alteration of Standing Orders 1161

ITALY—CAPTURE OF BRITISH SUBJECTS BY BRIGANDS—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard 1162

PORTS OF NORTH AND SOUTH SHIELDS—Question, Sir Matthew Ridley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1162

RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR—Observations, Viscount Palmerston .. 1163

Wednesday Sittings—Suspension of Standing Order 1163

Private Business of the Session—Observations, Viscount Palmerston .. 1164

Railway Accidents—Thomas Sweter and Others—

Moved, "That there be laid before this House Copy of any Papers relating to the inquest on the bodies of Thomas Sweter, George Kent, and William Anderton,"—(*Sir Lawrence Palk*) 1165

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 5.

Resignation of the Lord Chancellor—Personal Statement of The Lord Chancellor 1174

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 5.

Roman Catholic University in Ireland—Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir George Grey 1176

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 6.

Protection of Female Children Bill—(*The Lord Denman*)—Was *presented* read 1^{a*} (No. 255.)

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Speech of the Lords Commissioners. 1178

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 6.

The House met at a quarter before Twelve of the clock.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The Lord Commissioners 1184

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards a speech of The Lords Commissioners was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord President.

Then a Commission for Proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD PRESIDENT said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Command, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday*, the *Twelfth* day of *July* instant, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday* the *Twelfth* day of *July* instant.

LORDS.

TOOK THE OATH.

MONDAY, JUNE 19.

The Viscount Gort, a Representative Peer for Ireland.

SAT FIRST.

FRIDAY, JUNE 16.

The Lord Ashburton, after the Death of his Brother.

TUESDAY, JUNE 27.

The Earl of Morley, after the Death of his Father.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

THURSDAY, JUNE 15.

For *Liskeard*, *v.* Ralph Osborne, Esq., Manor of Hempholme.

For *Coventry*, *v.* Sir Joseph Paxton, deceased.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

THURSDAY, JUNE 22.

Coventry—Henry William Eaton, Esq.

FRIDAY, JUNE 23.

Devonport—Thomas Brassey, Esq., the younger.

MONDAY, JUNE 26.

Liskeard—Sir Arthur William Buller, Knight.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE *EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*,
APPOINTED TO MEET 31 MAY 1859, AND FROM THENCE CONTINUED TILL 7 FEBRUARY 1865, IN THE TWENTY-EIGHTH
YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FOURTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 12, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading*— Militia Ballots Suspension*; Militia Pay*; Trespass (Scotland)* (146); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (147).

Second Reading—Railway Debentures &c. Registry* (99) [H.L.]; Union Chargeability (122); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (127),

Select Committee — On Locomotives on Roads *appointed* and *nominated*. (*List of Committee*), and on June 13 Lord Harris *added* in the Place of Duke of Sutherland, Earl De Grey in the Place of Lord Stanley of Alderley, and Earl Ducie, Viscount Strathallan, Lord Calthorpe, and Lord Wenlock *added*.

Third Reading — Inclosure (No. 2)* (154); Lancaster Court of Chancery.*

UNITED STATES—BELLIGERENT RIGHTS.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF DERBY: I wish to ask the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs a Question with regard to two documents which have lately appeared in the public papers, having reference to American belligerent rights. The first of these documents appears to have been communicated by the noble Earl himself to the different Departments of Government, and the second purports to be a Proclamation of the President of the United States. The first document, addressed by the noble Earl to Government officials, is to the effect that peace having been restored throughout the territory of the United States, the status of the Confederates as belligerents must be taken to be henceforth abandoned. When that document was issued, the statement it contained that peace had been restored throughout the territory of the United States was not quite accurate; but, since the document was issued, the Confederate army, which was then in existence, and which was holding the extensive district on the further side of the Mississippi, and was said to be a powerful force, well organized, and capable of continuing the contest, has altogether surrendered; while the chief of the Confederate States, who for four years has maintained a struggle against the whole power of the United States, and who represented a population of seven or eight millions, is now a prisoner in the hands of the Federals and is awaiting his trial. The statement contained in the document issued by the noble Earl is, therefore, now practically correct, It may not be out of the way that I should express a hope, entertained not only by myself, but by the noble Earl opposite, not only by this House, but by the country at large and by the whole civilized world, that the party which has achieved such signal success will follow a course not dictated by revenge or violence—that they will seek not to exasperate the feelings of their former antagonists, which have been already too much embittered ; but will endeavour, by deeds of conciliation and of mercy, to re-cement, if possible, a union so nearly dissolved ; and that they will consent to treat those whom the fortunes of war have placed at their disposal not as revolted subjects, but as vanquished, though not dishonoured, enemies. On the course taken by the United States will materially depend the estimation in which they will be held by the civilized world, and, therefore, this is a subject which cannot fail to be of vital importance to them. I now wish to call the attention of the noble Earl to the answer which he gave the other evening to the question of the noble Baron (Lord Houghton), who asked him whether, under the circumstances which had occurred, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government still to continue to acknowledge the belligerent rights of the Confederate States. The noble Earl then gave an answer which was satisfactory to this House—namely, that this must depend entirely upon the course the United States themselves thought fit to adopt in the matter, and that as soon as the United States ceased to avail themselves of belligerent rights as against neutral commerce, this country would cease to acknowledge belligerent rights on the part of the Confederate States. Now, I desire to call attention to that answer, and to the light in which it is to be regarded in connection with the Proclamation lately issued by the President of the United States. That Proclamation directs that certain ports are to opened, but that others shall, for various and particular reasons, be closed for the present, and that the crew of any merchant vessel attempting to enter such closed ports shall be treated as pirates. No doubt the President of the United States exercises great powers, but surely he does not possess the power of changing the international law of the world. He may claim to exercise belligerent rights, and so establish a blockade, or he may make municipal regulations excluding vessels from certain ports ; but he cannot by force of a proclamation justify the infliction on those infringing these regulations the penalties attaching to piracy. The penalty for the violation of a blockade is well defined ; and the offence itself cannot be construed into the crime of piracy. To force an entry into these ports can simply be regarded as smuggling, and the assumption that any person guilty of an infringement of the regulations of the Proclamation is to be held guilty of piracy is one which it is impossible to pass unnoticed. I, therefore, wish to ask the noble Earl whether he has reason to believe that this alleged Proclamation of the President of the United States is genuine ; whether that Proclamation has been communicated to him ; and whether in that case he has taken any notice of it, and has protested against a doctrine which it is impossible for us to acknowledge, and whether he is prepared to communicate to Parliament any papers he has in his possession on the subject. I also wish to ask the noble Earl how far the circular he has sent round is compatible with the answer he gave the other evening, in which he stated that belligerent rights would not be withheld from the Confederate States so long as the United States put forward a claim to interfere with neutral commerce.

EARL RUSSELL, who was very imperfectly heard, said, I will first state the circumstances under which the letter alluded to by the noble Earl was issued. From what we had heard from time to time the noble Earl has been led to believe that the Confederates would be able to continue the contest in one part at least of the Southern States ; but from the more recent accounts it appears that the success of the Federals has increased from day to day, and that the Confederates are correspondingly less able to keep up the contest with their adversaries, and that the surrender of the entire armies of the latter was to be daily expected. Under these circumstances we had to consider what course we should pursue. There was some difficulty in the matter, because we had no regular communication from the United States assuring us that, as regarded neutrals, belligerent rights on their part had been abandoned. On the other hand, there was great difficulty in our continuing the concession of belligerent rights to the Confederates, because of the entire cessation of war on the continent of America, and of the fact that there were at sea two vessels, and only two—the *Stonewall* and the *Shenandoah*—which were supposed to be Confederate cruisers. One of these was supposed, or understood, to have been disarmed and given up to the authorities at Havannah; and the other, the *Shenandoah*, had put into various ports in the

Australian colonies. Obviously it would have been an anomaly, when the war in America had entirely ceased, that the *Shenandoah* should be going about from port to port in the British dominions obtaining coals and provisions under the Queen's Order of 1861. It was, under these circumstances, the question of putting an end to the belligerent rights came under the consideration of the Cabinet. Practically the whole of the American States were under the authority of the Government of the United States; the whole of the frontier is now in the possession of the United States Government. Since then Galverston has been given up to the United States' authorities, and General Kirby Smith has surrendered ; so that there is no military force whatever under Confederate authority. Before I wrote the letter to which the noble Earl refers I had an interview with Mr. Adams, the United States' Minister in this country, and I asked him whether his Government were ready to abandon their belligerent rights. He said he had no instructions on the point, but he was convinced that his Government were prepared to adopt that course. The communication made to the French Government on this point was still more explicit. That being the state of affairs, we believed it was due to the United States and to our own position to adopt the course which I indicated in the letter to which the noble Earl has called attention. I have no objection to lay the letter on the table. It has been published in the *London Gazette*, and it has been communicated to the maritime Powers generally. I may add that from Madrid and Copenhagen, as well as from Paris, we have received communications expressing a concurrence in our views. With regard to the question of the noble Earl on the subject of the Proclamation of the President of the United States, I must say that the document is certainly a very curious one. While, no doubt, it is right enough to announce in the Proclamation that, after a certain date, namely, the 1st of July, the Southern ports will all be open to foreign commerce —the reason given for the delay being the necessity for making certain Custom-house arrangements—the sentence at the end of the Proclamation with regard to piracy is somewhat startling. Sir Frederick Bruce states he has been advised that, according to the American law, persons attempting to enter those ports could not be convicted of piracy for that act; and that if persons should be arrested while attempting to enter them no Court of the United States can find those parties guilty of piracy. We must, therefore, presume that it is only intended to hold this threat *in terrorem* over parties who might be disposed to make the attempt. In the letter which I wrote it is stated, that within a certain time vessels sailing under the Confederate flag will be permitted to enter our ports and disarm. At the same time Her Majesty's Government do not pretend to in any way interfere with the legal rights of the United States. As to what the noble Earl has said, with respect to the action of the American Government, I took occasion, when addressing your Lordships on the assassination of President Lincoln, to express my great regret that a man whose views appeared to be so just, and who had so pledged himself to a course of mercy, should have been taken away at the moment when he could have put into practice those principles to which he had expressed so firm an adherence. I would again express my opinion that for the peace of the United States and of the world it is most desirable there should be no appearance of passion on the part of those who have now the guidance of the affairs of the American nation.

THE EARL OF DERBY: The noble Earl has not answered my question as to the Proclamation threatening a penalty not warranted either by the law of America or by international law. The noble Earl presumes that this Proclamation is held *in terrorem* over persons who might be disposed to enter those ports; but I want to know whether the United States Government have communicated the contents of this document to Her Majesty's Government, and whether he has asked for any official explanation of a threat which it is not competent to the American Government to carry out, and which is entirely opposed to international law. The document has been published in an official form to the whole world, and it is hardly consistent with our position that no notice should be taken of it.

EARL RUSSELL: It can hardly be said that no notice has been taken of it, as we have this despatch of Sir Frederick Bruce.

THE EARL OF DERBY asked whether the noble Earl would lay the documents on the table.

EARL RUSSELL was understood to reply in the affirmative.

LOCOMOTIVES ON ROADS BILL—(No.161.)

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, that as the noble Earl (the Earl of Hardwicke), who had charge of the Bill, was not present, he would move that the Lords whose names stood on the Orders of the Day be of the Committee, namely—

D. Richmond.	E. Romney.
D. Sutherland.	V. Melville.
M. Salisbury.	V. Eversley.
E. Caithness.	L. Silchester.
E. Hardwicke.	L. Rossie.
E. Carnarvon.	L. Stanley of Alderley.

Lord KINNAIRD said, he rose to call attention to what he thought the very unfair way in which names for the Committee had been selected. The course pursued was only calculated to lead to the belief that it was intended to defeat the Bill by a side-wind. He had been requested to move the second reading of the Bill; but he thought it better that it should be undertaken by a noble Lord on the other side. The Earl of Hardwicke agreed to do so ; but the impression from his speech was that he was unfavourable to the Bill; and he finally assented to the proposition that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. He (Lord Kinnaird) asked the noble Earl to allow him to see the proposed list of the Select Committee, and was referred to the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon), who had moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. On seeing the list, he found that the majority of Peers on it had either spoken against the Bill or had in private expressed opinions unfavourable to it. He asked the noble Earl to put on other names, and it was agreed that the list should not be handed into the clerk that evening in order that he might have an opportunity of consulting the noble Earl who had charge of the Bill. He waited on the noble Earl at his own house, and represented to him that the Committee would not be considered fair, as having prejudged the case. The noble Earl agreed at once to add other names, and on having a list handed to him of Peers in whom the agricultural interest would have confidence, he said that he would put them all on. That was on the 29th, and on the 30th the names stood on the Orders of the Day. He arrived in the House almost five minutes after the Order came on, and was informed that the noble Earl opposite had complained of the addition, and insinuated that there was something irregular in it. It was explained that it had been done by the noble Earl who moved the second reading (the Earl of Hardwicke), and he invited the noble Earl who wished to have the Bill referred to a Committee to be present in the House on the Thursday, to communicate with his noble Friend who moved the second reading. The noble Earl said he would be unable to attend; but to his (Lord Kinnaird's) surprise there appeared in the Votes for the Friday another list of names. This, he thought, was an insult to those Peers whose names had been removed without communication with them, and was a proceeding not worthy of the House. He could not help thinking that such a course of proceeding was extremely unfair, and was not consistent with the mode in which their Lordships' business was usually conducted. He had no interest in the matter except as the owner of two traction engines; but in his district he was satisfied that no magistrate could interfere with them. But the case was different in England, where the Home Secretary had issued an order prohibiting the travelling of traction engines upon public roads except at night, the result of which would be to put a stop to the use of those machines. He was surprised to find that the opposition to this Bill should proceed from the party opposite, who called themselves peculiarly the "farmers' friends." That there was a strong feeling among noble Lords upon this subject he knew, because one noble Lord had given notice that any of his tenants who should use an engine near a road should lose his farm; and in the county of Kent the police had given notice that if an engine merely crossed a turnpike road in the daytime a fine would be enforced. He thought the subject had not been properly dealt with, and he should move that the names of Lords Wenlock, Harris, Ducie, and Strathallan, should be added to the proposed Committee.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, he had expected that the Earl of Hardwicke would have been in his place that evening to move the names of the Members of the Committee; but in his absence he (the Earl of Carnarvon) considered that, as he had originally moved that such a Committee should be appointed, it was only fair he should submit to their Lordships the names of its Members. He should, however, disclaim any responsibility for the selection of those names, and he thought it was not fair to charge him with attempting to pack the Committee and to prejudge the question. His only object was that the Bill should be carefully considered, because he believed it to be a dangerous measure. The list was the one he had originally proposed, with the addition of two names recommended by the noble Lord opposite. He believed it was a perfectly fair list; but he had not the least objection that there should be added to it the names which the noble Lord had suggested. He thought that it would be better upon occasions of that description to abstain from imputing motives, and he was not aware that he said anything to deserve the noble Lord's censure.

Lord KINNAIRD said, that he felt satisfied with the noble Earl's explanation, as far as the noble Earl himself was concerned. But the fact remained that the list had been changed, and he thought he had a right to complain of the manner in which that change had been effected.

Earl GRANVILLE said, it was clear that there had been some little misunderstanding upon this matter, and he thought it would be more regular if, in the absence of the noble Earl (the Earl of Hardwicke), the noble Lord would postpone his Motion for adding the names of the noble Lords he had mentioned to-morrow.

Motion *agreed to.*

And on *Tuesday* June 13, Lord Harris added in the Place of Duke of Sutherland, Earl De Grey in the Place of Lord Stanley of Alderley, and Earl Ducie, Viscount Strathallan, Lord Calthorpe, and Lord Wenlock added.

UNION CHARGEABILITY BILL—(No.122.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I must express my regret that the duty has not fallen into more competent hands. That regret is, however, much lessened by my full conviction of the justice and wisdom of the measure; and this, and the fact that your Lordships are well acquainted with the subject, will render it unnecessary for me to trespass on your attention with many facts or arguments to induce your Lordships to consent to the second reading. The Bill is intended to remedy evils with regard to the settlement of the poor which were complained of in Parliament itself more than eighty years ago; and since that time there have been incessant complaints, both with regard to the treatment of the poor and the unjust and sometimes excessive incidence of taxation upon the ratepayers. Many of your Lordships remember the serious agricultural riots of 1830, and the great inquiry which was subsequently instituted; your Lordships are also well acquainted with the Act which was passed in 1834. At that time the Commissioners were unanimous in recommending that the settlement and chargeability should be extended from the parishes to the unions; but it was found impossible to embody that recommendation in the Bill owing to the serious opposition which it encountered from the close parishes. There is no doubt, however, that that Bill effected most important and useful changes. It established a central authority and committed the administration of relief to a more intelligent and responsible body. But, at the same time, the evils proceeding from the chargeability to the parish were rather aggravated than otherwise; because, as the general charges of the union establishments were fixed, not upon the rateable value, but upon the general average, there was an additional inducement to parishes to endeavour to get rid of their poor. In 1839 the Commissioners in their Report expressed their deep regret that that portion of the Bill relating to union chargeability had not been carried. In 1844 Sir James Graham brought in a Bill without success, and in 1845 renewed the attempt with the same result. But in 1846 Sir Robert Peel introduced and passed the Personal Irremovability Act, intended as some relief to the landed interest in consequence of the repeal of the Corn Laws. By the provisions of that Bill no pauper could be removed if he had remained in one place without obtaining relief for five years; but then the expense of his relief subsequently fell, not upon the union, but upon the parish to which he belonged. This was felt to be so intolerable that next year it was found necessary to introduce a Bill transferring the chargeability of this particular class of pauper from the parish to the union. This, no doubt, was a great step in advance. Great irritation was, however, felt by the larger and more populous parishes, and in consequence a Parliamentary Committee was appointed in 1858. The Committee reported, I believe, in 1860, that with regard to the chargeability to the unions, instead of the general average, the rateable value should be taken, that the area of residence should be extended to the whole union, and that the period of residence should be reduced from five years to three. An Act was passed in 1861 carrying out these recommendations; and it will perhaps be curious to your Lordships to learn how different were the results from what had been expected. Between 1855 and 1861 the charges on the common fund for the irremovable poor were something like 22 per cent. The year preceding the passing of the Act they were 24 per cent, the year succeeding 44 per cent, and they have constantly gone on increasing until at the present time the charges upon the unions, as compared with the charges upon the parishes, exceed one-half, or 51 per cent. The present Bill is intended to carry out that which was recommended by the Commissioners of 1834, but only partially adopted at the time. There was one difficulty with regard to the settlement of any of these questions, which the Union Assessment Act of last year has removed. By that Act power was given to parishes to unite themselves into an union; but as it was necessary to procure perfect unanimity on the part of all the guardians of the parishes concerned, the desired object has usually been frustrated because of the interested opposition of at least one guardian, and the Act has proved almost inoperative. There is no doubt that all the changes that have taken place in the Poor Law have been of great benefit to the poor themselves, and that the removals have much decreased in consequence of the legislation which has been made upon this subject. In 1841 the removals in England numbered 23,000; and in 1861 they had diminished to 13,500. The Irish especially have greatly benefited, for during the distress of 1847 the removals from Liverpool alone were 15,000, and during the late cotton crisis they numbered from all Lancashire only 404. This Bill proposed to throw the relief of the poor, not upon the parishes, but upon the whole union. It therefore renders unnecessary the removal of paupers from parish to parish in the same union, and therefore takes away a constant source of discord among guardians. It further reduces the term of three years' industrial residence to one year. I apprehend that great benefit to the poor will attend the transfer of the power of removing paupers from the overseers of the parishes to the guardians, who are likely to exercise the power with much greater care. It will be of much advantage, too, that the stimulus to the removal of the settled poor will be diminished. For many years the destruction of cottages and their non-erection in the places where they were most wanted has been a crying evil. The Commissioners reported upon this point in 1834 in very strong language, and the destruction of cottages has been shown to inflict great hardship upon the labouring poor, and to be productive of great demoralization from the overcrowding and the mixing of both sexes in the same rooms. The Commissioners appointed by the Poor Law Board in 1850, to inquire into the question of union chargeability, took evidence to show that it was the custom of the close parishes to throw the labourers upon the open ones, thereby inflicting great injustice upon the ratepayers, and producing dreadful demoralization by crowding the labourers and their families into lodgings wholly inadequate for their decent accommodation or any proper separation of the sexes; and a metropolitan Member has recently stated that it is utterly impossible, after the statements made by the owners of close parishes themselves, to deny that cottages were pulled down for the purpose of saving such parishes from the cost of maintaining the poor, of whose labour however they had availed themselves. Mr. Caird, a Member of the other House, was particularly encouraged by Sir Robert Peel to report upon the state of farming, and that Gentleman stated in his Report that in a great many instances labourers were obliged to live at a great distance from the place where they worked, and that sometimes they had to walk as far as four miles in the morning and evening; and he said that in some instances farmers lent donkeys to those of their labourers who were so circumstanced, in order that they might not become too exhausted for their work by these daily forced journeys. Most of your Lordships are probably members of the Royal Agricultural Society, and your Lordships will find that nearly every one of the prize essays of the Society, in dealing with almost every county in England, insists on the great advantage to agriculture which would result from not binding the labourer to the place in which he was born. There is a Report to which I must allude, which has not been drawn up to support this measure, as it has been received since the Bill was prepared. Dr. Hunter was requested to report to the Committee of Privy Council with regard to the sanitary arrangements of the cottages of the poor; and, although some of his statements have been called "sensational," they have been borne out by the more recent testimony of a Poor Law Board Inspector. I do not think it is surprising that a humane and intelligent man, finding evils existing of the grossest description, not owing to natural causes, but to vicious legislation, should have expressed himself strongly; and what we have to consider are, not the expressions he has used, but whether the facts he gave are accurate or not. I know that there is one statement made by him which has been impugned, and that has reference to the figures which he took from the Census, and for which he is certainly not responsible, giving the number of houses and the increase of population. He found that in about 800 parishes there was an increase of the population, with a decrease in the number of houses. It has been endeavoured to be shown that this is fallacious, because it does not agree with the Return subsequently moved for in the House of Lords; but in that subsequent Return no care was taken to distinguish between the inhabited and the uninhabited houses—Dr. Hunter's statement, including all houses, whether inhabited or not, while the Return in question comprises inhabited houses only; and the fact remains that, while about 180 or 190 of those parishes have the same number of houses or rather more, and 100 have exactly the same, about 600 have a reduced number. Dr. Hunter gives a description of an open parish in Cambridgeshire where the labourers employed in several adjoining parishes reside, and where he found the cottage accommodation to be of a very disgraceful and overcrowded character. Some complaints were made that he had exaggerated the true state of the case; but the Poor Law Board sent an Inspector afterwards to the place to inquire into the facts, and that officer's Report showed that Dr. Hunter had in no one respect exaggerated the truth. The Inspector states that he found that the rector and other inhabitants of the parish expressed themselves as aggrieved because their parish had been singled out for comment, when it was not worse than others in the neighbourhood, as far as the cottages were concerned, and was even better in regard to drainage and freedom from nuisances. The working of the system in making the open parishes pay for the labourers when sick, whereas the adjacent close parishes enjoy the benefit of their labour when they were well, is unquestionably most unjust and anomalous. Here, my Lords, is a letter recently addressed to the Poor Law Board by the clerk of the Bourne Union, illustrating by an individual case the hardships to which labourers are exposed—

"Bourne, March 3, 1865.

Sir—I am directed by this Board to request the advice of the Poor Law Board upon the following case, and as to the course they should pursue under the circumstances. Thomas Skeith, aged thirty-two, an able-bodied man, his wife, and three children, belonging to Careby, in this union, are now in the workhouse; the guardian has offered him work at 12*s.* a week, upon which the Board, considering the man not destitute, having work to go to, are inclined to discharge him the house; the man is willing to go—in fact, would not be in the house if the guardian would also find him a house or lodging in Careby or at any village near, and here lies the difficulty. Careby is the sole property of a resident gentleman, and there are no spare, nor, indeed, not sufficient cottages for its own poorer class; the pauper says he cannot (and in this the Board have proof) get either lodgings or a house within any reasonable distance, and, taking the nearest place in which he could obtain a house, he could neither walk to or from his work daily, nor could he afford to keep up a house for his family and a lodging near his work for himself, and he cannot get work in a place to which he does not belong.

"I am, &c., J. L. Bell, Clerk."

That, my Lords, I think is an example of a shocking state of things. It is quite impossible to deny that the labourer is kept in a position of positive serfdom by that state of things. He may be ready and anxious to work, and yet by the operation of the law he is unable to avail himself of the offer of employment. As has been wittily remarked, it would be about as easy for a tree to remove itself with its roots to a neighbouring wood as for such a labourer to remove himself to a parish in which he might find work. The second point, of perhaps the greatest importance in this Bill, is that it will place the irremovable poor upon the same footing as the settled poor. The irremovable poor are employed without reference to their skill or industry, but simply owing to the fact of their irremovability. Such a system discourages industry, because the settled poor man knows that it is not only the interest, but the necessity of the farmer to employ him, while it discourages the deserving ablebodied man, because he knows that, however skillful and able he may be, his labour cannot be made use of till all the other labourers have been provided for. And this is not only a disadvantage to the labourer himself, but also to the farmer, because it obliges him not to employ the best man, but, for the reason I have stated, to hire a worse man because he happens to be settled in the parish. Upon this point I will appeal to the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, who has given evidence showing that the present system is a gross injustice to the industrious labourer. I think, my Lords, I have said enough to make out a *prima facie* case for the second reading of this Bill. But I see upon our paper the notice of a Motion of a fatal character as regards this measure. I therefore venture to ask your Lordships to bear with me while I make a few observations on the objections which may possibly be raised in this debate. And first, it may be said that inquiry is demanded. I think I have shown that this matter has for years been inquired into, and not only that, but the results of those inquiries have to a certain extent been acted upon, and by each successive inquiry and the results of its partial action thereupon the Legislature has been induced to proceed a little further in the direction of this measure. Therefore I say that, having inquired for thirty-five years, it is time now that we took some decisive action on a subject of such great importance to the country. Another objection, which is rather more plausible, is that it is necessary before passing this Bill to make some arrangement for the revision of the existing unions. Now, I do not wish to contend that in the original formation of the unions all the parishes were always grouped together in the most perfect and most convenient manner. No doubt local circumstances sometimes made it less perfect than it otherwise might have been. But it is said that a Committee of the other House which sat in 1847 recommended that facilities should be given for revising the boundaries of unions. Now, I would give one reason why this Bill should not be delayed for any such revision. The Report of the Committee in question was made nearly twenty years ago, and the unions have now become such recognized and settled divisions for many purposes that they could not be changed without very great inconvenience. Let me quote to your Lordships on this point a letter addressed to the Poor Law Board by Major Graham, the Registrar General. That letter says—

"General Register Office, Somerset House,
May 29, 1865.

"Sir—I observe that perons desirous of changing the boundaries of unions are making urgent representations to the Poor Law Board that extensive alterations should be made in them. I take the liberty of remarking that if such a course be adopted great inconvenience and derangement will occur in this office, formed nearly thirty years ago for the civil registration of births, deaths, and marriages, upon the basis of Poor Law Unions, this department being intimately connected with the arrangements of the Poor Law Board. Since 1837, births, deaths, and marriages have been registered in unions; and Boards of Guardians have provided register offices fitted with fire-proof repositories for the safe custody of the public records suitable to the population of each union, the inhabitants of which now know where to resort for the purpose of obtaining certified copies of the registers; if boundaries of unions are changed, and new register offices are consequently provided, increased expense and inconvenience to the public will ensue. Since 1837 the number of births, deaths, and marriages registered in each year in unions has been compared, and all calculations as to number of births of each sex, and number of marriages according to the rights of the Established Church, and by civil contract, and all calculations as to rate of mortality, have been annually based upon the numbers thus recorded in unions, such calculations being extensively used by the Lords of the Privy Council, and by Local Boards of Health, and by medical officers of health. The same system has also been adopted by the Poor Law Board in their valuable Reports, giving from year to year statistics as to pauperism and industrial employment in each union. In the decennial Census, also, there is the same arrangement. In the Census tables presented to Parliament in 1851 and 1861 is to be found from 1801 to 1861, arranged in unions, a comparison of the number of males and females, showing increase and decrease at each of these seven periods, accompanied with a statement as to houses, ages, occupations, birthplace, and number of families, for purposes of comparison. At the next Census of 1871 all calculations will be materially lessened in value if great alterations are made in the boundaries of existing unions. The circuits of County Court Judges are also founded on the basis of unions as at present formed. And for the balloting of militia authority is given by statute to Courts of Lieutenancy to adopt Poor Law Unions. For these reasons I venture to deprecate the changes which are recommended. As to parishes and townships under the Act of Elizabeth, and in Gilbert Incorporations, I am aware that from time to time changes are unavoidable; and I know that it is most desirable that they should be formed into unions; but I presume to express a hope that the Poor Law Board will not be induced to make extensive changes in unions already formed and used for the purposes I have above indicated.

"I have, &c.,
"GEORGE GRAHAM, Registrar General.
"The Secretary, Poor Law Board, Whitehall.

"When the unions were originally formed local difficulties prevented in some instances the selection of the most convenient groups of parishes, but the existing areas have been so long established that it would be as difficult to interfere with them as with the boundaries of counties."

The third objection is that large areas have been found to fail in times of pressure, and are unfavourable to economy in administration; but I believe this objection to be entirely without foundation. The Commissioners of 1834 were not of that opinion, and they adduced a great many facts which totally contradicted that view of the case. The Commissioners took 100 large and 100 small parishes, and they found, upon carefully going through the accounts, that the charges were four or five times greater in the small than in the large areas. Again, in the City of London Union, from which I have presented a petition in favour of the Bill, the expenses of administration are very much greater than they are in the larger metropolitan parishes outside the City. The Poor Law Inspectors, in reply to a question on the subject, gave answers totally at variance with this objection to the Bill. We have received a letter from the Board of Guardians of the Docking Union—a Union which has availed itself of the provisions of the Act of 1834, and united its parishes together for the purposes of uniform rating—that shows that the system has worked admirably, and that after its adoption the expenditure decreased 10 per cent, whereas in the surrounding districts the charges have only decreased 1·82 per cent. The system is also working well at Oxford and Cambridge, which are unions for rating and settlement under local Acts, and the local authorities of both towns are in favour of the Bill. Sir Edmund Head, a great authority upon this subject, in a letter to the President of the Poor Law Board, prefacing the reproduction of an article addressed by himself to the *Edinburgh Review*, shows how illogical is the objection not to allow unions to pay all instead of half their charges, as at present. If the argument in favour of the limited area is to have full weight, the objectors, to be consistent, ought to ask the Legislature to take a step backwards and restore the control of the relief to the overseers of the parish. Another objection to this measure is that it will confer a benefit upon the towns to the disadvantage of the rural districts. If the towns have been paying more than their share hitherto, I can see no objection to the pressure of the burden being equalized; but I believe the statement contained in the objection to be incorrect, for many towns, such as Torquay and Bedford, instead of gaining will lose by the operation of the Bill. In my opinion the old and poorer towns will be the gainers, while the new and richer will be the losers by it. With regard to the town of Aston, to which reference has been made, it will lose greatly, whereas every surrounding parish will gain by the Bill. The last objection is that it is unjust to transfer the incidence of taxation in the manner proposed by the Bill. But every alteration in the incidence of taxation is open to the same objection. Does not every fresh Budget of every Chancellor of the Exchequer shift the burden of taxation from one class to another? If the Chancellor of the Exchequer produces a War Budget, and it seems that the charges will fall too heavily on one class and too lightly on another, are not attempts constantly made to adjust the burden more fairly? And, even if the objection were valid, it is too late to make it now. The Act of the 1st of Elizabeth—the Act which first introduced the Law of Settlement—might certainly have been open to the objection; but that Act was confirmed by that of Charles II., which was followed up by the Act of George III., and by that of 1846, when Sir Robert Peel shifted 20 per cent of the whole of the tax for poor relief from one class of persons to another class. In the following year still further changes were made; while the greatest change of all was made when Parliament imposed upon the whole of Ireland a new Poor Law system. The reasons in favour of the Bill are many; one is that it will do away with the want of uniformity in the present system, by which one portion of the poor is relieved from one fund and another portion from a different fund; and another reason is that it will result in providing sufficient accommodation for the labouring poor, under the defect of which so large a part of them are now suffering, and that it will release the farmers from that practical restriction which confined their choice of labourers to those who were settled in the parish. By passing this Bill you will give practical effect to the principle of union rating and union settlement contemplated by the Commissioners of 1834, and partially provided for by the Poor Law Amendment Act, and you will act in accordance with the recommendation of Committees of the House of Commons, and especially of the Committee on Poor Law Relief, who made their Report last year; and you will be adopting the principle of the scheme which has been advocated by all eminent statesmen who have given their attention to the subject, such as the late Sir James Graham, Sir George Lewis, and by writers of such practical experience as Sir Edmund Head, and you will be acting in conformity with the decision of the House of Commons who have passed the Bill by such large majorities, composed not merely of town Members, or of Members of one party, but whose numbers were swollen by a large number of country Members. My Lords, notice has been given that the Motion for the second reading is to be met by an Amendment of the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Rutland) that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Upon this Amendment I have to say that, in the first place, it is irregular. The noble Duke may object to the second reading of the Bill, but it is not in accordance with the custom of your Lordships' House, to move that a Bill be referred to a Select Committee until it has been read a second time. The second objection I have to offer is, that the House of Commons will not receive the Bill if it be sent back to them with any changes in the clauses made in their Lordships' House, as being an infringement of their privileges. It is also to be recollected that those Bills which are referred to a Select Committee are usually Bills of great detail which cannot be considered conveniently in a Committee of the whole House; whereas this Bill is one the principle of which is affirmed in a single clause, and that that principle is merely expanded and defined in the several other clauses. My noble Friend (the Duke of Rutland) is a most popular and liberal landowner, and is incapable on a question of this sort of being influenced by considerations as to the effect of the measure on his own property; but many landowners are of opinion that the Bill will not be of advantage to owners of land, and there is a belief that the opposition to it is dictated by class interests. I should regret if any noble Lord who is not in favour of the Bill should be led to vote for it through fear of his motives being misconstrued; but if any noble Lord, on the other hand, does not think that the reasons for the Bill are good, he ought to show so by his vote in public and in the full House, and not to refer it to a Select Committee, where the discussion will be in private. It may, in reply, be said that the House of Lords is entitled to reserve to itself the right to improve the Bill, and that, when they have done so, it will be for Her Majesty's Government to introduce into the House of Commons a new Bill in accordance with those improvements. This would be asking the Government to make bricks without straw. How could the Government, approving as they do the Bill which is now before your Lordships, and after this Bill has received the approval of the House of Commons, consent to undo all that has been done by undertaking to bring in a new measure? I hope the Bill will receive a full discussion on the second reading, or on whatever other stage a debate may be thought desirable; but I must ask your Lordships to understand that Her Majesty's Government distinctly object to the proposition of referring it to a Select Committee. I have great hope—I trust I am not too sanguine in the expectation—that your Lordships will agree with the Government and the House of Commons that this is a Bill which should pass, as a measure important to the labouring classes, and therefore vitally important to the whole country.

LORD BROUGHAM said: In rising to second my noble Friend's Motion, I will make a promise almost always broken as soon as made—not to detain the House at any length. This time the promise will be kept, for I have merely to state in support of this important measure, that it was in the contemplation of the Government of which I was a Member in 1833, and that we strongly desired that it should form a part of the great change which we then effected in the laws relating to the poor. My lamented Friend Lord Althorp endeavoured to carry this into effect; but, after repeated attempts, he was compelled to give up that intention, and indeed the great amount of the changes which we were then carrying through made it incumbent on us to postpone this to another time, desirous as we were of then introducing it. When I moved the second reading of the great Bill in this House, I stated that thirty years would not pass under the new system before we should add to it this important measure of making liability continuous in the management, and I trust that my prediction is now about to be fulfilled.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^{a}.—(*The Lord President.*)

THE DUKE OF RUTLAND, in moving the Amendment of which he had given notice—that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee—said, he wished, in the first place, to dispose of the objection that it was not in his power, on the Motion that the Bill be now read the second time, to move as an Amendment that it be referred to a Select Committee, by referring to a precedent from the Journals of their Lordships' House. On the 27th of February, 1835, on the Motion of the Duke of Richmond, a Bill for the Abolition of Tolls, which was read a first time, was referred to a Select Committee; and in regard to the observation of the noble Earl the Lord President that the tendency of his Motion was to defeat the Bill he frankly avowed that if it should do so it would not break his heart. He had two objections to the Bill—firstly, that it would work with great injustice and unfairness as between one class of the community and another; secondly, that it would tend to the total destruction of the parochial system. He believed that no one who considered the provisions of the Bill impartially could fail to see that it would relieve one class of the community at the expense of another. It was of course of his own neighbourhood that he could speak with the greatest authority, and he would refer to the union of Grantham. He found that the operation of the Bill would relieve the town of Grantham of rates to the amount of £1,100 a year, and would impose that amount on the smaller agricultural parishes in the neighbourhood. That was a large burden to impose on poor agricultural parishes. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) had only done him justice in supposing that merely personal considerations would not influence him in respect of this measure. Even although the Bill affected him individually he hoped he would have the courage to perform what he considered a public duty; but so far as he was concerned, this Bill only made a difference of £9 a year. But, on the other hand, a clergyman wrote to him from Leicestershire that in his parish the rates would be doubled, though there were only thirty inhabitants in it, and not one pauper; this clergyman would have to pay £30 a year. Another gentleman told him that though on his estate there were only five labourers, all of whom were ablebodied, he must pay £130 a year. If they were about to change the incidence of taxation in this manner they ought to make the great manufacturing and commercial interests pay their fair share of the burden. It was right in former times to place the burden of supporting the poor on the owners of land; but now large fortunes were made by the manufacturing interests, and they ought to be called upon to pay in proportion to their earnings. A house in the town of Grantham which was rated at £100 a year, and in which thousands might be earned, and a farmer's land, three miles off, rated at £100 a year, which might return him perhaps nothing, perhaps a few hundreds, were to be rated equally under the Bill. Let him take another case; that of a mill employing 300 hands. A cotton famine came, and these people were thrown out of employment; the mill under these circumstances would not pay a single penny towards the poor rate, because it was closed, and the consequence was the district had to support the mill hands. As these would be some of the effects of the Bill, he thought he was not going too far when he asked for such an inquiry as would enable their Lordships to thoroughly understand all the bearings of the question. But he did not know that he should have troubled their Lordships on the subject, were it not for the great objections he entertained to the Bill as destroying the parochial system. In that way he believed that it would inflict an immense injury on the working man. In the agricultural districts the way in which the parochial system worked was this. A labourer was thrown out of employment in consequence of something or other—perhaps a frost. The farmer knew that if he did not find him something to do he would have to support him in the workhouse; and he argued in this way:—"If I find him employment during the two or three weeks of frost I shall get the benefit of his labour; but if he goes into the workhouse I shall have to pay 8*s.*, 9*s.*, or 10*s.* a week without getting any return." If this Bill were passed the poor man would lose that safeguard. This was no theory merely; many facts might be brought forward to show that it was what often happened. Last winter a friend of his in Leicestershire told him that one day a labouring man came to him to ask what he should do, as he had been thrown out of employment. His friend asked the man whether he had been round to all the farmers in the parish, and he said he had. "Well," said the gentleman, "I can't find you employment myself, but the best thing you can do is to go back and tell them that if you can't get employment you will go into the workhouse." The man went away, followed the advice, and employment was found for him immediately. Another instance he had heard of from the chairman of the Sleaford Board of Guardians. That gentleman told him that the only time he was really afraid of the operation of the New Poor Law was some ten years ago, when a body of some sixteen labourers came to him to tell him they were out of employment, and asking what they should do. The chairman said, "Well, I can't find you work, but the best advice I can give you is that you all go into the workhouse, and depend upon it you won't be there long." The men followed his advice and went in; but they were very soon found work, for the farmers knew that they would have to pay more for them in the workhouse than they would have to pay if they were at work. But if this Bill passed, the labouring men would not get work in such cases—the workhouses would be filled, and the rates would be increased. In the name of the labouring man, therefore, of the old decrepid and infirm man, who could only give half a day's work, he called on their Lordships to pause before they passed this Bill. He trusted that their Lordships would show that they were the friends of these poor people, and that they were not afraid to record their votes with his. He had in his hand a statement from the surveyor of roads in the Newark district, which showed that if this Bill passed it would throw into the workhouse a great number of men who were now maintained by working upon the roads. This officer had prepared a list from which it appeared that out of the seventy-eight men employed under him, only nineteen were ablebodied men receiving the full wages of 2*s.* a day. Upon the passing of this Bill all but these nineteen would probably be thrown out of work, because as the parishes having to maintain their own roads, and not having to maintain their own poor, would insist upon the roads being repaired at the least possible expense which could only be done by employing the best men. In many of the rural parishes the burdens would be much increased; and the poor who were not ablebodied would be sent into the workhouse, which to them would be an imprisonment for life. The only argument he had heard in support of the Bill, was that in certain close parishes cottages had been pulled down, and, further, that the labourers in some instances had to walk long distances to their work. He did not for a moment deny that instances might be found throughout the country in which cottages had been pulled down, and the labourers had to get cottages in the neighbouring parishes. He also did not deny that the labourers sometimes had very long distances to walk to their work and back. But the question was, would this Bill prove a remedy for this state of things? It was certainly a question which required very great consideration; and he must certainly say that he doubted very much whether the Bill would provide a remedy. He believed that the reason why cottages were not built was that they did not pay. If landlords built cottages, and put a sufficient rent upon them to pay, the consequence would be that the labourers could not inhabit them because they could not afford to pay that rent. His own belief was that if this Bill passed there would be still fewer cottages. At the present time there was throughout the country a great movement in favour of building cottages; but he feared that this movement would be arrested by legislation of this kind. Partly from benevolence and partly from interest the movement was spreading, and the landlords were beginning to discover that it was not for their interest to pull down cottages and drive the labourers into other parishes. Where cottages had been pulled down the rates had decreased in their total amount, but the value of property had decreased in a greater proportion and the rate in the pound had increased; whilst in other parishes into which the labourers had been driven—as he admitted they had in some few instances—in these parishes the rates had, indeed, increased, but the value of property had increased in a greater proportion, and the rate in the pound had diminished. As the owners of property pondered these things the condition of things complained of would altogether cease, and there would be erected more cottages than had been built of late years. Now, with regard to the long walk of the labourer to his work, he believed that there was great exaggeration on this matter. No doubt in some instances they had to walk long distances, and he believed that in some cases they preferred the walk. Not long ago he himself was about to build some cottages, and, being in doubt as to where he should build them in the village or in the fields, he took the advice of those best able to judge. He got most contradictory advice, and, therefore, he built in both places—a part near the fields where the work was done, and a portion in the village. Those which were by the fields he could get no one to occupy, and the only answer he got when he inquired what was the cause, was that the labourers did not like to live in a lonely spot, but preferred to live in the village. The labourer did not like to live away from everybody else; he liked to be near the church, and near his club, and in a spot where his wife could, when she wished to go out, find some one to take care of the baby. These were practical matters of which Mr. C. P. Villiers and his Poor Law Commissioners knew nothing—they did not understand it, and he hoped that their Lordships would send the Bill to a Select Committee, so that the matter might be explained to them. He should like to say a few words in reference to the question of area. It was now proposed to extend it; but he believed that all previous experience was opposed to such a course. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) himself had mentioned one instance which occurred in the time of Elizabeth. He had said that the burden of taxation was shifted in the time of Elizabeth; but the truth was that the change was from a large area to a small one; and why? It was because the poor found that the large areas were intolerable. In the reign of Charles II. the same thing again occurred, and the reason was stated in the Act in this way—

> "The inhabitants of certain northern counties, and of many other counties, cannot, by means of the largeness of the parish, have the benefit of the Poor Law."

Coming to more recent times, when the New Poor Law was introduced into Ireland, in 1837, they had very large areas; and ten years afterwards Sir George Grey had to propose a Boundary Commission; and the Commissioners made some fourteen Reports. It appeared that in the north and east of Ireland, where the unions were smallest, the people were employed the best, and in the south and west, where the unions were largest, they were the worst employed; and the Commissioners recommended that the unions should be reduced from large ones to small ones, and that the electoral districts should be likewise reduced; and this was done. He hoped, therefore, that noble Lords connected with that country would give him their support in seeking to obtain for England the same justice that had been done to Ireland in this respect. Now, with respect to removals, which were mentioned as one of the great evils of the present system, the noble Earl (Earl Granville) admitted that the number of removals had enormously decreased. He (the Duke of Rutland) knew that in his own union, when the poor law came into operation, the removals, compared with what they now were, were as twenty-seven to one; in the last year there were but six removals from one parish to another within the union; and he was informed on very good authority that if things were only allowed to go on as they now were there would soon be almost none from parish to parish and very few from union to union. The Bill was beginning to operate upon this question even before it had passed. A neighbouring Union had sent notice to the Grantham Union that they would allow no more outdoor relief, but the paupers must be sent to their own Union, the object being that the friends of the pauper might support them for a year, when they would become chargeable to Grantham. The same thing was going on all over England, and the poor were being forced out from the places where they lived, and driven to their own unions. He wished to refer to Dr. Hunter's Report, and he would observe that it was a Report which appeared to have been got up in great haste, for the Doctor had not time to investigate thoroughly the circumstances of the districts through which he passed. In 1849 there were eight Commissioners sent into fourteen counties, but Dr. Hunter was himself sent through the whole of England. What he did was to go here and there to find out parishes where cottages had been pulled down; but if a Committee were granted they could fully investigate the matter; and he might observe that when Mr. Baines, in 1854, brought in his Union Chargeability Bill he gave up the question of these open and closed parishes. The noble Earl had not alluded to the Committee of 1860, and, therefore, he need not refer to it; but he begged to remind their Lordships that it was not until 1864, after three new Members had been added to the Committee, who were known to entertain views favourable to union rating, that any Report was made in its favour. If the Bill was passed on the slight evidence possessed upon the subject the country would be unjustly and wrongly treated, and therefore it was that he protested against this measure being passed in this slovenly and off-hand manner. He entertained a strong conviction that if they legislated upon this subject without sending the Bill to a Select Committee it would be an entire failure, and would create ill-feeling between towns and country, but above all they would destroy that feeling of unity of interests and that affection which now existed between the rich and the poor man—the employer of labour and the employed, between the man who found work, and the man who did the work, and therefore it was that he hoped their Lordships would vote in favour of the Amendment. He did not think that the objection that by so doing they would be putting themselves in opposition to the House of Commons, would weigh one instant with their Lordships, because a few weeks hence the present House of Commons would be scattered all over the country, and a new House would be elected who might be of a different opinion upon this subject; and therefore it could not be said that their Lordships, by sending this Bill to a Select Committee, would be putting themselves in opposition to the House of Commons. He hoped their Lordships would think that he had made out a case for a Select Committee, and would agree to his Amendment.

Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("be") to the End of the Motion and insert ("referred to a Select Committee.")—(*The Duke of Rutland.*)

Question proposed, "Whether the Bill be referred to a Select Committee."

EARL SPENCER said, he unfortunately felt obliged to differ from all the conclusions to which his noble Friend (the Duke of Rutland) had come—in fact, he thought that if his noble Friend's arguments were worth anything they went against the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 itself. The opinions of persons who were entitled to consideration, and the Reports of Committees and Commissions, were uniformly in favour of the adoption of union instead of parish rating, and Bills had been introduced both into their Lordships' House and into the House of Commons embodying that principle. Moreover, the Irremovable Poor Act of 1861 rendered this change almost indispensable. The results of the Irremovable Poor Act, which had been in operation for three years, were very remarkable, for, as shown by the noble Earl who introduced the measure, 51 per cent of the poor all over England had been charged to the common funds of the unions, and this was a most important fact to be borne in mind in dealing with this Bill. The principle of the Bill had been adopted in the original Poor Law Act of 1834, and had been expanded in 1861—it had been found to work beneficially, and this Bill proposed to extend its operation still further. If they regarded the condition of the poor in England, they would find it to be very unsatisfactory. They would find that while in one parish labour was insufficient, in another and an adjacent one it would be superabundant; that while in one parish the labourers were accommodated in blocks of beautiful and convenient cottages, their neighbours crowded or herded in places where none of their Lordships would like to crowd stock. They would find, too, that one parish, only very recently rated to the poor at all, had at its side a less fortunate neighbour upon whom the rates fell very heavily. As a rule, the lightly rated parishes would be found to belong to one, two, or three proprietors only; while the heavily burdened parishes belonged to a great number of small proprietors. The origin of the present state of things was not of recent date. With reference to the demolition of cottages, he might say that he did not believe that demolition was carried on to any great extent. Even in this direction, however, he thought that the Bill would effect much indirectly. He had taken considerable interest in this subject, and had made rather extended inquiries on his own estates. In a parish in Northamptonshire, belonging almost entirely to himself, out of thirteen men and three boys employed by one farmer, only two resided in the parish, and in case of sickness or old age all the rest of his labourers would fall for support on the neighbouring parish. He had a Return of the rates of two adjoining parishes, and he thought it would be curious to compare these with the rate of the close parish just alluded to. He would take the one that was in the same union. In that close parish in 1860 the amount paid to the common fund was £1 19*s.*; there was no relief at all to the poor or the lunatic; in 1861 £2, and in 1862 £1 17*s.* was all that that property paid to the maintenance of the poor. In 1863 the Irremovable Poor Act came into operation, and the contribution rose in that year to £30, and in 1864 to £22 6*s.* In the neighbouring open parish to which he had just referred the charge to the common fund in 1860 was £88 3*s.*, in 1861 it was £81, and in 1862 it was £74 6*s.* But observe the remarkable change wrought by the Irremovable Poor Act. In 1863 from £74 6*s.* the amount fell to £38 10*s.*, and in the following years it stood at about the same sum. The clerk of the union informed him that the effect of that Bill on the two parishes he had quoted would be that in the close parish the rate would be increased from £22 6*s.*, its present amount, to £57 5*s.*, whereas the open parish, which, under the existing system, paid £190 16*s.* 6*d.*, would by that Bill have to pay £99, or a decrease in the open parish of about 50 per cent. This, he thought, was sufficient to show the great hardship now borne by the open parishes in having to maintain in their sickness and old age the poor who worked in the neighbouring parishes. He had made inquiry, and confidently believed that on his estates for the last fifty years not a single cottage had been demolished without better ones having been built in their place. No doubt the science of agriculture had greatly increased of late years, and there had been an increased demand for labourers; but unfortunately new cottages had not been built in proportion. He should be sorry to see the Amendment of the noble Duke passed, for he thought it would be the greatest possible boon to the labourer if parochial chargeability were done away with. It would be an enormous benefit to the labourer to have the area of his labour extended. The present law worked most prejudicially on his interests. A farmer wished to employ a certain number of men. He employed two or three of the most skilled and best-conducted men in the village, and he would be glad to get a labourer from the neighbouring parish; but he knew that there were two or three idle men with their wives and families in his parish, and that if he did not employ them he must help to maintain them. He, therefore, discarded the well-conducted labourer in the next parish. That depreciated the value of good labour, and dragged the good labourer down to the dead level of the bad one. The present Bill would likewise benefit the farmer by giving him better labourers to do his work; and it would, moreover, remove the discouragement which now existed to the building of cottages. A proprietor would be enabled to obtain better rents for his cottages if the higher class of labourers were encouraged. He happened himself to live in Norfolk, in a union which had the honour of having adopted the principle of union chargeability. He referred to the union of Docking, which comprised thirty-six parishes. A tenant of his, who had been Chairman of the Board of Guardians, had furnished him with information as to the operation of the principle there. That gentleman had written a letter to him on the subject, to which he could not help calling their Lordships' attention. After stating that he attended a Board where there was a fair attendance of Guardians, and had talked over points to which he had called his attention, the writer said—

> "But one opinion was expressed, and which I am quite sure is entertained by every guardian in the union, and the more so by the *ex officio*, that the adoption of the union instead of the parish rating has worked most satisfactorily, and that no one has seen cause to regret its adoption. One most important result has been that to the good labourer it has been of much benefit, has raised his moral character, and enabled him to find ready employment in the several parishes (thirty-six) of the union. The employers are too glad to employ men of good character coming from any parish in preference to those of their own parish of doubtful or inferior character. I also asked the opinion of the guardians as to the effect upon wages, and we are perfectly in agreement that the average wages of our labourer has been, and continues to be, somewhat in advance of the rate paid throughout the county generally. I am quite confident that the rates in the Docking Union have not increased in a greater degree than other unions in the county, but, I believe, rather the reverse. I ascertained from our books that we have scarcely had an able-bodied labourer in our workhouse for some years."

He believed, then, that this Bill was not only sound in theory, but sanctioned by practice. The noble Duke (the Duke of Rutland) thought it would check economy, but he himself believed it would cut down expense. There were some 15,000 parishes in the country and only about 600 unions. Therefore, by diminishing the extent of removals they must proportionately diminish cost. It was often said that the large parishes would no longer have an interest in looking after the expenditure; but if the large parishes did not care to look after the expenditure the farmers in rural parishes who had an addition made to their rates would, he thought, be inclined to look rather sharply after it. With regard to a revision of unions, he believed that some acts of injustice would be done if some alteration were not made in that respect. Let him take the case of the union of Northampton. There the union extended into rural districts nearly all round the town; but in one direction it extended much further. There were two parishes in the union, one nearly seven and the other five miles from the town, where the rates would be considerably increased; while another parish, almost a suburb of Northampton, one and a half mile from the town, would not be affected at all, as it belongs to a union of a strictly agricultural nature. Here the re-distribution of unions would be clearly an act of justice.

No doubt cases of hardship might arise out of the proposed change, but he had no wish to jeopardize this measure, which was of so much importance to the poor and to the country, by endeavouring to introduce safeguards against such cases of partial injustice. He thought it would even be better that a little injustice should be done than that so valuable a measure should fail to be passed into law.

THE EARL OF ST. MAUR said, that one of the main points to be considered in connection with this measure was that of taxation. There were, he thought, two principles which might be appealed to in rating the taxation—they might tax a man in relation to his property, or they might tax him in relation to his employment of labour. He thought in neither case was the taxation fairly apportioned, for in the former case landed property was heavily taxed, whereas funded property was lightly taxed; and in the latter instance the employer of the labour might contrive in many ways to evade the payment of the amount of his fair share of the burden of supporting his workmen when no longer capable of working. It must, however, be borne in mind that in whatever way they raised the taxation there must always be a great difference between those who lived in the towns and those who lived in the country. The great evil of the present system, in his opinion, was that it kept the labourer fixed to the place where there was, perhaps, no demand for his labour. This Bill was founded on the recommendations of the Committee of 1861, but that Committee had expressed a very slight opinion on the subject, relegating it to the further consideration of Parliament. A Return laid before Parliament showed that, while the removals from parish to parish were only 366, the removals from union to union were over 5,000; so that after all it would only be the smaller number which would be touched by this Bill. He had intended to propose Amendments on the Bill, but he should not press them.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said, he felt it his duty to give his cordial support to the Bill. He considered it a great wrong that those who had enjoyed the advantage of the poor man's labour while he was able to work, should be able to relieve themselves of his support in sickness and age; and this wrong the present Bill would, to some extent, diminish. The noble Duke who moved the Amendment had referred to the diminution of extent of the electoral divisions in Ireland; but the result had been the creation of close and open parishes, which all persons must deprecate, and the production of inequalities of rating in populous and thinly-inhabited districts. The consequence had been that many cabins had been pulled down with a view to reduce the rating, and that was not a result which it could be desired to see produced in England.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: The noble Earl the President of the Council, in moving the second reading of the Bill, expressed a hope that it would not be treated in a party spirit. I concur in that wish; but I must say that if anything like party feeling be imported into this subject, Her Majesty's Government will have to thank themselves for that result. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced this Bill into the other House is a Gentleman of great Parliamentary reputation; but I confess I was very much disappointed with the course he has pursued in reference to this measure. Not a single taunt had been spared, not a single imputation had been wanting, in the addresses of the right hon. Gentleman which could stir up animosity and bitterness of feeling among his political opponents.

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: I really must call the noble Earl to order. It is out of order to refer in this manner to debates in the other House, and if the noble Earl should pursue this line of remark I shall feel it my duty to answer the charges he makes against my right hon. Relative, which are wholly incorrect.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I have said all I desire to say upon that point, but I do not think the noble Earl need have put the rule to which he refers so strictly. I may be permitted to observe that the Report which the Government has laid before Parliament gives me another, and, I think, a reasonable ground of complaint against them. That Report related to the condition of the agricultural labourers in England. When a Report is issued by the Government with its official *imprimatur* we expect that it shall contain the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; but we find that in another place, to which I will not more particularly refer, as the noble Earl is so strict in enforcing the rule of the House, the statements in that Report were completely demolished.

THE EARL OF CLARENDON: They were the usual agricultural Reports which are laid before Parliament.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I am referring to the Report upon the conditions of the agricultural labourers of England. When we find that that Report contains misrepresentations of fact in page after page, then I say we have some reason to find fault with the Government. [The Earl of CLARENDON: Hear!] The noble Earl cheers, but he must remember that that Report was put forward by the Government as the foundation of this Bill. [The Earl of CLARENDON: Hear!] Really I must appeal to the House whether I ought to be subjected to such un-Parliamentary interruptions.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I do not think the noble Earl opposite is acting altogether in conformity to the usages of Parliament. Surely the noble Earl does not mean to say that no Peer can utter a word about the Poor Law Board. No doubt the Gentleman at the head of the Poor Law Board is the noble Earl's relative; but, in discussing a subject of this kind, what can be more natural than to remark upon the course pursued by the President.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I assure the noble Earl I did not intend to apply my remarks personally to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Poor Law Board. I was simply commenting upon the Report which was quoted as justifying the introduction of this Bill. I do not know that the President of the Poor Law Board had anything special to do with that Report, which came from the Privy Council. In that Report it was stated that the inquiry had been but partial, and could not be exhaustive; and it is just upon that ground that I object to the statements contained in it being used to warrant the introduction of this measure. When an inquiry is partial and not exhaustive, those who make it should be careful to represent only facts. In order to show the value of that Report, I may refer to a passage in which, referring to some cottages built by the Duke of Bedford, it is observed, "It is ungracious to criticize, but more could be done if money was not lavished on useless, and often noxious, porches." I think any gentleman who could write such a paragraph must be either ignorant or ill-informed. There is no portion of cottage accommodation so necessary as a large protecting porch. I do not wish to go further into that matter, but I simply want to know what is the real object and end of the Bill. I quite admit, with the noble Duke who has moved the Amendment, that there are certain difficulties involved in this subject; that there will be a considerable shifting of burdens, and that in many instances some injustice will be done if this Bill passes. I have again to find fault with the Government, because if they had brought in a preliminary measure for a revision of the boundaries of unions the difficulty would in some degree have been met. If this Bill passes in its present bare and naked shape it is inevitable that an amount of hardship must be inflicted in some cases that need not have been inflicted. I am not, however, upon these grounds prepared to object to this Bill. There has been no change in the Poor Law since 1834, which has not led to a shifting of burdens and alterations in the charges upon property. All recent legislation upon this subject, however, seems to be tending to one point. And now arises a serious question. It has been urged that this Bill is only a part of still greater changes, and that if we agree to union rating we shall come ultimately to an equalization of the metropolitan poor rates, then to county rating, and, finally, to a national rate fixed upon the Consolidated Fund. I put aside the question of equalizing the metropolitan poor rate, because the circumstances are peculiar; but if I thought that either county rating or a national rate would follow the passing of this Bill I think it would be a fatal objection to it. But I do not think there is any substantial reason for such apprehension. The Bill is the substitution of a larger for a smaller area of rating, making the union the unit instead of the parish. That is a change, I admit; but I also find that the Bill is a security for standing still in the future. At this moment we have an undeniable, and, logically, indefensible anomaly—we have one area for rating and another for management; but the moment you remove that anomaly and make the area of rating and the area of management coterminous, you take up a position by which the argument for further change is removed. I cannot concur in the argument of the noble Duke (the Duke of Rutland) who believes that the widening of the area of rating will be attended with a diminution of the jealousy and watchfulness exhibited by the Guardians over the expenditure. I do not entertain any fears of that kind. There may be, and I think there will be, at first, a slight increase of expenditure; but I do not think that that will be permanent when things have settled down into their ordinary course. The farmer who is elected Guardian of the parish will soon cease to draw any distinction between the primary fund, in which he is personally interested, and the common fund, in which he is interested only in a secondary degree, and will soon feel that his personal interest, as well as that of those he represents, is to attend to the proper and economical expenditure of the moneys intrusted to his charge. But who are those who really at this moment transact the financial business of the union? Are they the representatives of parishes A, B, C, D, or E, or of the parishes comprised in the union generally? I believe that in nine cases out of ten the work devolves upon a small minority, who, from local reasons or special interest in the subject, are regular and systematic in their attendance. I think that the work will practically remain in the same hands as before, and the management will follow in precisely the same channel, and I cannot therefore imagine that the formidable results are likely to accrue from the passing of this measure which some Members of your Lordships' House anticipate. My noble Friend the Duke of Richmond has placed in my hand a Return from the union over which he presides. That Board consists of forty-six elected and thirteen *ex officio* Guardians; and out of those fifty-nine the average attendance for the twelve months ending in March of the present year was only eleven. The noble Duke is unfortunately absent, owing to a family bereavement; but I have his authority for stating that he substantially concurs in the view of the subject, which I have had the honour of laying before your Lordships. I think it is plain that as soon as the measure becomes law you will have to increase the discipline and severity in your unions. If, however, the Bill contemplated any such course with respect to the metropolis, such a fact would weigh greatly against the Bill in my mind. I may say, in conclusion, that both the advocates and the opponents of this measure appear, in my opinion, to overrate its probable results. My noble Friend (the Duke of Rutland), on the one hand, apprehends consequences more formidable than are likely to arise; while Her Majesty's Government, on the other hand, promise more than is likely to be realized; for, according to their account the labourer will, in consequence of this Bill, be set free and enabled to carry his labour into the most profitable market. The Act, however, and I believe it is a fair and moderate statement, will have the tendency to remove a certain amount of artificial restriction which now weighs upon the labourer; and, on the other hand, I believe it will have the effect of removing a certain amount of discouragement which the landlord encounters in providing cottage accommodation. I have noticed, and I have no doubt your Lordships have also remarked, that in many of our country parishes the race of ordinary labourers is inferior to the preceding generation. This is, no doubt, in a great degree attributable to the growth of towns which have been gradually absorbing the best and the most intelligent of our labouring class; the recruiting sergeant has drawn away many; and others have left because the cottage accommodation is not sufficient either in quantity or in quality to tempt them to remain. The question is, undoubtedly, a very difficult one. For my own part, however, after having given a good deal of consideration to the subject, I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

EARL GREY: My Lords, I cannot help thinking, after giving the subject some consideration, that Dr. Hunter's report, which has been so often alluded to, conveys no overcharged picture of the condition of the agricultural labourer. In the south of England the condition of the agricultural population is much to be deplored. The wages are miserably low, and while in the north of England they are 14*s.* a week, and oftentimes more, in the south labourers receive only 8*s.* or 9*s.* —a pittance on which I can scarcely conceive how they manage to exist—he is also miserably lodged. This state of things has produced the results which might reasonably be expected, for farmers who have taken farms in the south have felt bound to confess that though the price of labour is nominally cheap, it is in reality dear. The measure now under your Lordships' consideration is one which I believe cannot fail to effect much good; for by the law as it at present stands the agricultural labourer is placed in a position destructive to all motives to industry, and one which is demoralizing, corrupting, and injurious in its effects. It is also mainly owing to the state of the law that the present low rate of wages is maintained, and that labourers become, from their misery and poverty, both physically and morally unfitted for their labour. I shall, therefore, give my most cordial support to this measure, because I believe it is intended and calculated to remove the obstacles which prevent the improvement of the condition of the labouring classes in this country. The noble Duke (the Duke of Rutland) who has moved the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee has virtually called upon us to reject the measure altogether; for, although his Amendment is otherwise worded, your Lordships all know that his real object is to defeat the Bill—and, indeed, the noble Duke scarcely concealed his desire for its rejection. If, after the second reading of the Bill, it had been proposed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee to examine into its details, I could have understood a Motion of this kind; but to send the measure to a Select Committee before it has received a second reading can have no other object than to obtain information to enable you to judge whether its principle is good or not; and such an inquiry at this period of the Session would be tantamount to the rejection of the Bill. The measure is one calculated to remove obstacles which now prevent the improvement of the labourer's condition, and those who attended to the noble Duke's speech must have observed that it furnished the most conclusive arguments in favour of the Bill. The noble Duke said that when there is a frost the labourer can get employment, because he goes to his employer and tells him, "If you don't employ me, I shall go to the union, and that will cost you more." Does not the noble Duke see that that is the very vicious principle against which this Bill is directed, and against which also the New Poor Law Act of 1834 was directed, though ineffectually, because the provisions making the area of taxation coterminous with the area of administration were not adopted—the vicious principle, I mean, of setting relief against wages? The same principle which makes the farmer employ his parishioner during the frost also makes him employ him in the summer, though he is ever so bad a workman, in preference to an inhabitant of another parish, though he is ever so clever a workman. But for the existence of that pernicious system, how can you account for the fact that there is such a difference in the rate of wages paid in the north as compared with the south of England? You have a vicious law which keeps the labourer settled in a particular parish and makes him reluctant to give up his settlement in that parish, and you thus prevent the improvement of the labourer's condition by preventing the natural diffusion of labour throughout the country. The noble Duke says the Bill, by causing a great shifting of burdens, will produce extreme injustice; and he told us that the rector of a parish in Leicestershire stated that there were only thirty inhabitants in that parish and that his correspondent now paid no poor rates, whereas, if this Bill passed, its effect would be to make him pay £30 a year. And this the noble Duke calls a very great injustice. Now, my Lords, I say that the injustice is in the present state of the law. An agricultural parish with only thirty inhabitants and no paupers, and which will have to contribute £30 a year, must contain land of very considerable value, which again must be cultivated by means of labourers drawn from other parishes; and when those labourers, with their wives and families, now happen to fall into destitution, they must be thrown upon those other parishes for support. The injustice, then, is in maintaining a state of the law which enables the owners of property in certain districts to obtain labour from other quarters to cultivate their land and produce their rents without contributing their fair share towards the relief of that destitution which will always exist. I will not, my Lords, at this hour, trespass further on your attention. I am convinced that the more you think of this measure the more you will see that it is sound in principle, and that it will carry into effect the views of those distinguished men, the original Commissioners of Inquiry into the Poor Law, to whom the public owes a deep debt of gratitude for the manner in which they exercised the functions assigned to them, and laid the foundation of, perhaps, the greatest reform that could be effected in any country. We are now asked to carry into effect their views, and the views, I believe, of almost every man who has been either a Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner under the new Poor Law, and also of our ablest writers on political economy.

Lord **REDESDALE** said, he should support the Amendment of the noble Duke behind him. The Bill was propounded as a panacea for all ills, and as designed to produce a new state of things among the poorer classes of this country—to secure them more uniformity of employment and provide them with better cottages; but he did not believe it would do anything of the sort. It proceeded on a wrong principle, because it did not settle the question which required settlement—namely, the question of settlement itself. Indeed, the passing of that Bill would throw an impediment in the way of the permanent and proper adjustment of that important question, by dealing only with a part of it, and giving an advantage only to those classes who would have an interest in preventing its complete and satisfactory adjustment. The Bill contained a provision declaring that poor persons should not be removed from the union in which they had resided one year. How would that affect a town like London? Almost every parish there was a union, and if a pauper went from one parish to another he became removable, and would be sent to the country parish to which he belonged, to the relief of the town in which he had laboured the best days of his life. This would not occur generally in the country unions, and this partial treatment of the subject will operate prejudicially against a fair adjustment of the settlement question. The operation of the New Poor Law in the agricultural districts had been, on the whole, beneficial; but it had not worked well in the metropolis, and mainly because those who had to administer it in the metropolis were not acquainted with those whom they had to relieve, while in the country they were both acquainted with and interested for them. The Bill sought materially to increase the area of taxation; but the argument to be drawn from past experience was against such a course. When the compulsory Poor Law was established in the reign of Elizabeth, the area of rating was something like the sessional division—namely, the districts in which the justices met. In the 39th Elizabeth it was made parochial, from which we may judge that the larger area had not been found to work well; and fifty or sixty years after, in Charles II.'s time, it was found necessary in the north, where the parishes were large, to reduce the area so as to make the rateable districts coincide with the townships, and the preamble of the Act for this purpose states—

> "Whereas certain counties by reason of the largeness of the parishes within the same have not nor cannot reap the benefit of the Act of 43rd Elizabeth for the relief of the poor."

If it was urged that these precedents relate to distant periods and a different state of society, he would refer to the latest legislation on this subject. When the Poor Law was introduced into Ireland the unions were the first rateable districts; but they would not work, and after an experience of eight or ten years a Commission was appointed who reported in favour of reducing the areas, stating that—

> "To avoid impositions by affording local examinations and control, as well as to approximate to the natural condition of family support, some division of the country into contributory districts has been thought necessary."

When he was examined before the Committee of 1860, he stated that relief was compulsory charity, and that the object must be to get it under the same influences as were brought into action when charity was exercised, and at the same time consider its bearing as compulsory as affecting the interests of the ratepayers as well as of the poor. The Bill would give no security that in large districts proper discretion would be exercised in the administration of the funds; and although it was admitted that in many cases injustice would be done by making the existing unions the areas for common rating, it would be very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to alter them. How was it possible to get other parishes to unite as proposed for the purpose of uniform rating? Was it likely that the parishes adjoining the Northampton Union, mentioned by the noble Earl opposite, would unite with that union when all that they could obtain by such a change would be a considerable increase in their rates? The questions involved in the Bill were of the greatest importance, and should not be dealt with by Parliament until after the fullest inquiry had been made with reference to them. The Returns showing the alterations which had been made in the rating of parishes by the operation of the Act of the year before last had not yet been laid on the table, and until that was done they could not judge how far that Act had been just in its operation. He did not think the character of the guardians of the poor would improve under the proposed system. They would not give so much personal attention to the poor; they would have less interest in keeping down the expenditure by finding employment, and the result would be most unsatisfactory, both to the poor and to the ratepayers. Those who argue against a different amount of rates charged on parishes within the same union as unjust, forget that every landed proprietor acquired his property under those conditions. He had bought or inherited it with the knowledge that it was subject to taxation of a given nature and extent. Parishes had been mentioned where this Bill would alter the rates to the extent of 3*s.* in the pound; but if a man had purchased property upon a certain estimate of value, and then this Bill passed and reduced its value 3*s.* in the pound, he surely had a right to complain that his property had been seriously decreased in value, while the property of his neighbour had been proportionately increased. This was not the case of an imposition of taxation ; for the first time, as in Ireland, where a uniform rate had been introduced, no similar system having existed before, it was the change of a burden which had been borne from the time of Elizabeth to the present day ; and it was a burden of which no one had any right to complain, because he had acquired his property subject to it. Suppose the case of a farmer who had just taken a farm upon a lease for twenty-one years, this Bill might make this difference to him, that he would have to pay a great deal more for his farm than he had expected and calculated when he made his bargain. Surely such a man would have a right to complain. So many questions had been raised and so many interests were involved by the Bill that they could do no better than postpone it until they had fuller information on various points, and until a new House of Commons had given their opinion upon it, and the delay of a year in passing the Bill ought not to weigh for a single moment. He should certainly support the Motion that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

On Question, Whether the Bill be referred to a Select Committee ? Their Lordships *divided* :—Contents 24 ; Not-Contents 86 : Majority 62.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Then the original Motion was *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

CONTENTS.

Rutland, D. [*Teller.*]

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.

Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Haddington, E.
Mayo, E.
Powis, E.
Selkirk, E.
Stradbroke, E.

Berwick, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Churston, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Dinevor, L.
Dunsany, L.
Egerton, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda*)
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sherborne, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Westminster, M.

Albemarle, E.
Belmore, E.
Cadogan, E.
Caithness, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
De La Warr, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Ducie, E. [*Teller.*]
Fitzwilliam, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Manvers, E.
Minto, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Spencer, E.
Stanhope, E.
Strafford, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.

Eversley, V.
Hawarden, V.
Torrington, V.

Bath and Wells, Bp.
Ely, Bp.
Lincoln, Bp.
Llandaff, Bp.
Ripon, Bp.
St. David's, Bp.
Winchester, Bp.

Abinger L.
Belper, L.
Bolton L.
Camoys, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley*)
Colville of Culross, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne.*)
Delamere, L.
De Saumarez, L.
De Tabley, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Houghton, L.
Hunsdon, L. (*V. Falkland.*)
Keane, L.
Leigh, L.
Lyveden, L.
Methuen, L.
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Rivers, L.
Rossie, L. (*L. Kinnaird*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sondes, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Suffield, L.
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Taunton, L.
Truro, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.

House adjourned at Ten o'clock, till To-morrw, half past Ten o'cloock

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, June 12, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee Resolutions* [June 8] *reported.*

Public Bills — *Ordered*—Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * [208].

First Reading — Companies Workmens' Education * [191] [*Lords*]; Parsonages * [205] [*Lords*]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * [208].

Second Reading—Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. [197]; Colonial Laws Validity * [183]; Colonial Marriages Validity * [184]; Penalties Law Amendment * [213]; National Gallery (Dublin) * [203]; War Department Tramway (Devon) * [204] [*Lords*]; Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * [201].

Committee—Roman Catholic Oath [86]; Record of Title (Ireland) [151] [*Lords*] — R.P.; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment (*recomm.*) * [187]—R.P.; Crown Suits, &c. * [146]; Penalties Law Amendment * [213]; Inland Revenue * [169]; Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c., Amendment * [196].

Report — Roman Catholic Oath [86]; Crown Suits, &c. * [146]; Inland Revenue * [169]; Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c. Amendment * [196].

Considered as amended — Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment [178]; Prisons * [141]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * [177].

Third Reading — Defence Act (1860) Amendment * [176]; Procurators (Scotland) * [157]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) * [131], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Writs Registration &c. (Scotland) * [48], [Mr. Dunlop].

WESTMINSTER IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

[*Lords*] (*by Order.*)

SECOND READING.

Bill read 2°.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed."

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, he rose to propose that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, half the Members of which should be selected by that House and half by the Committee of Selection, with an Instruction to the Committee to introduce a provision into the measure to secure the erection of buildings suitable to the accommodation of the poorer population whose dwellings were to be removed by the Westminster Commissioners under the Bill. He should, therefore, move the Amendment of which he had given notice, on the ground that this was a hybrid Bill, partaking both of a public and private character.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words "to a Select Committee, half the Members to be named by the House, and half by the Committee of Selection."—(*Mr. Augustus Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. TITE said, this was distinctly a private Bill, and had passed the House of Lords as such. A Commission was constituted under a Bill which passed in 1860, for the purpose of winding up that most unfortunate speculation of the Westminster Improvement Commissioners in Victoria Street. The latter body raised £300,000 on mortgage and £700,000 on debenture bonds. The mortgages were of a most complicated kind, and they were remitted to the Court of Chancery, and as the money was realized it would be paid into that Court for distribution to those who were entitled to it. With regard to the £700,000, they were doing their best to realize such payments as remained. The Commission had remitted to them two improvements under the Bill of 1860 for the widening of two streets opening into Victoria Street, and the great charities in Westminster were all in favour of the Commission obtaining the powers sought by this Bill. The Bill was entirely unopposed, and they did not ask power to take down more than twenty-seven houses, which were of a most miserable description, and those in Union Court appropriated to the vilest purposes.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that there was no doubt whatever that this was a Private Bill, and he hoped that the hon. Member for Truro would withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. DODSON said, the Bill had passed through the House of Lords as a Private Bill, and if it had been a Public one it would not have been there treated in the manner it had been. He therefore hoped the hon. Gentleman would withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, that in withdrawing his Amendment he must express his regret that the Bill had not been treated on this as it was on a previous occasion as a hybrid Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the hon. Member appeared to be under a misapprehension with regard to hybrid Bills. When a Bill was introduced into that House as a Public Bill which involved private interests it was subjected to the same examination which was provided for Private Bills; but strictly Private Bills were never turned into hybrids.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Bill be committed.

THE SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

QUESTION.

MR. AYRTON said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government will be pleased to extend to the Officers and Clerks of the Civil Service, who have presented a Memorial, the Saturday half-holiday allowed in other Establishments?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON said, it was intended to appoint a Commission composed of a few persons connected with the Public Offices to ascertain how far the prayer of the memorial referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman could be complied with without materially inconveniencing the public service. It would be very desirable that, if possible, what the memorialists asked should be granted, but he was unable to state to what extent it could be done until after the inquiry had been made.

CUSTOM HOUSE CHARGES.

QUESTION.

MR. LYALL said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Why the Custom House authorities charge the merchants for the attendance of their officers on goods in transit after their arrival within the docks, as, in that case, the officer is immediately removed from the ship or lighter, but this charge continues to be made though no officer is employed?

MR. PEEL said, in reply, that the privilege of removing goods in transit without examination was given on condition that the merchant should defray all the expenses incurred by the Crown in consequence. Goods within the docks still required watching, the only difference being that the officer who watched them was on land instead of being on board the lighter.

MR. LYALL said, he understood that one officer acted for a great number of ships.

MR. PEEL said, in that case the ships would only have to pay for one officer.

WEST INDIES POSTAGE RATES.

QUESTION.

MR. CAVE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Postage of Letters from France to the West Indies, *viâ* Southampton, by the Royal Mail Steamers amounts to eightpence, while that from England amounts to one shilling; and, if so, on what principle?

MR. PEEL said, in reply, that our charge was 1*s.* per half-ounce from this country to the West Indies, and the principle upon which it had been fixed at that rate was in order to make the service, as far as possible, self-supporting. The French Government charged 8*d.* for a quarter of an ounce, and 1*s.* 4*d.* per half-ounce, from France to the West Indies, through this country. He did not know by what principle their rates were regulated, but they only paid us 1*s.* per ounce for those letters which we conveyed for them in our packets.

ROMAN CATHOLIC OATH BILL.

[BILL 86.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Form of Oath.)

MR. HASSARD said, that in consequence of the count-out on Friday night he was prevented from moving that it should be an instruction to the Committee to draw up one uniform oath to be taken by Members of that House. He understood it was incompetent for him to move now the Amendments of which he had given notice.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS: Sir, in rising to propose an alteration in line 32 of this clause I shall not feel it necessary to make any lengthened observations, having stated on a former evening the reasons which induced me to offer this Amendment to the Committee. The Bill originally was introduced on the ground that certain provisions in the oath taken by Roman Catholic Members were unnecessary and offensive, and attention was directed more particularly to that portion of the oath where the person taking it is made to declare that he doth—

> "Renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that persons excommunicated by the Pope or other authority of the See of Rome may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or other persons whatever."

It was said, "You there make a Roman Catholic Member of the House depose that he disavows that which he does not admit ever was a tenet of the Church to which he belongs; and you make him do what is tantamount to saying that he does not intend to commit murder himself or countenance it in others—a demand which is directly offensive." Now, that has always seemed to me a very sound view of the case; and, accordingly, I was very glad to see that passage omitted from the earlier part of the proposed oath. In like manner, the latter part of the oath necessitates the repudiation of any intention to equivacate, evade, or use mental reservation—an assumption which Roman Catholic Members held it was an insult to a man of honour to put forward. The provision is offensive and unnecessary, and, therefore, I think it ought to be omitted. Up to that point I entirely go with those who propose this Bill, but there, I am afraid, my agreement with them stops. There is another part to which the arguments employed in bringing forward this Bill have no application whatever, and that is the part of the oath I propose shall be restored. It makes the person who takes it declare as follows:—

> "I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws; and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom."

The Committee will observe that we are not engaged in composing one uniform form of oath for every Member of this House, though whether it may be the will of the House in a future Session to entertain that question I have no means of knowing. The work upon which we are engaged is simply the modification of the Roman Catholic oath; and the question is, how we are to remove from the oath everything which is unnecessary and everything which is offensive, at the same time preserving all that is substantial and all that designates the purpose and the end for which the oath in the first instance was introduced. In that view of the case I cannot help thinking that no argument has been advanced for omitting that portion of the oath which I ask the Committee to restore. The only one I have heard attempted has been this—that the defence of the Church, of the Protestant religion, of Protestant institutions in this country, does not rest on an oath of this description, but on far higher grounds. I quite agree that the defence of the Church and of the Protestant institutions of this country rest on higher grounds—on the affections of the people, and on the persuasion entertained by the great majority that those institutions and that Church are best calculated for the happiness and welfare of the people. But I ask the Committee to observe how much too far the argument I have mentioned goes. In the oath which we propose to pass I find this provision—

> "I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the Crown, which succession, by an Act intituled An Act for the Further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants."

You might just as well apply the argument here, and say the succession to the Crown does not depend on the oath to be taken by individual Members of Parliament, but on the loyal affections of the subjects of this country, and on the feeling pervading the whole of this land that the succession which has conferred blessings without number upon the country is not one they would willingly surrender. Yet we do take this oath as a mark and pledge from those having seats in this House that they will defend the succession which has become the established succession in this country. And in the same way it was as one of the guarantees for the security of the Established Church, not merely the branch of the Established Church in Ireland, but the Established Church as a whole—it was, I say, as one of the guarantees for the maintenance of the Protestant Government and of the Protestant religion in every part of the Kingdom, that this oath was introduced in the year 1829, and formed part of the terms upon which our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects obtained seats in this House. As to its having proved efficacious in its operation, I will not trouble the House with a repetition of various instances which have been already brought under its notice. I might advert by name to the declarations, not of those who still sit with us, but of others who have passed from us, that this oath did prevent them from entering upon any aggressions on the Established Church and Protestant Institutions of the country; and though I cannot of course mention names, I speak with considerable confidence when I say that many Members of the House at this moment feel themselves in the same way bound in honour by this oath. What is the proposal which the right hon. Gentleman makes? He wishes to have this oath abrogated, because he desires to be free to do the very thing the oath was framed to prevent. He says, in effect—

> "We desire to be perfectly free to attack the Established Church, to overthrow it when we can, where we can, and how we can; and because we find this oath an impediment in our way we desire to remove it."

I trust the Committee will not assent to the proposition so openly avowed, and so completely antagonistic to the purpose for which the oath was originally introduced. In proposing to add to the clause the words of which I have given notice, I am simply moving to restore the oath, so far as it relates to the Established Church, to the form given to it in the year 1829.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 32, after the word "Realm," to insert the words,

> "I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this Realm, as established by the Laws; and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by Law within this Realm; and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom."—(*Sir Hugh Cairns.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. HUNT: Sir, it is with great regret that I differ from my hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down; and I feel anxious not to give a silent vote upon this subject. I have always fought with him in support of the Established Church, and I hope to do so again, and therefore, I am anxious not to lie under the imputation of being a supposed enemy of the Church by voting against his Amendment. My hon. and learned Friend has alluded to the possibility of some uniform oath being framed in a future Parliament in lieu of that now taken. I was in hope there was no need for delay, but that we might have taken advantage of this golden opportunity, and by sweeping away all marks of religious differences between persons coming to that table have handed down a glorious legacy from an expiring Parliament to its successor. For myself, I do not despair of seeing such an oath introduced and carried during the present Session. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Hassard) has told us that he was unfortunately prevented by an accident from moving his Resolution on Friday, which, if done, would have allowed the Committee to go into the subject to-day. I go even farther than the hon. Member for Waterford. I would like to see, not a uniform oath, but a uniform declaration, from all Members of the House. At present some hon. Members of the House are unable to take an oath, but they are allowed to make a declaration. I do not see, if the hon. Member for the Borough of Northampton (Mr. Gilpin) goes to the table and makes a declaration of allegiance, why the Member for the County of Northampton (Mr. Hunt) should not do the same. The hon. Member for Northampton objects to taking an oath. I do not; but I consider a declaration in my case just as good as an oath. I draw a distinction between a promissory oath and an oath to give true evidence. When you take an oath in a court of justice to speak all you know, you are aware of all the circumstances that can affect your mind at the time; but when you take an oath as to your future conduct, you take an oath without knowing what the circumstances may be, which may influence your mind when the time comes for action. I should like to see all promissory oaths done away with, and a declaration substituted. You, Sir, have ruled that we cannot so alter the Bill in its present stage, but I think it can be done on a future occasion, and I hope the House will consent to its being done. If in 1865 the House re-imposes a distinctive oath on Roman Catholics, we may be interposing an obstacle to the future consideration of the larger question of the substitution for oath of a general declaration. The hon. Member for Belfast puts it to the House that this oath is a great bulwark to the Established Church, and he is therefore anxious to preserve it. Now, I do not consider it any bulwark at all. I regard it as an obsolete, a clumsy, and a worn-out contrivance. It will be the same sort of defence as the Dannewerke was to the Danes, when expecting an attack by the rifled guns of the Prussians. My hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns) says that, so long as we keep up this prohibition, certain hon. Members will be deterred from taking a certain course. Now, I think that every Member of the House ought to be free and competent to vote on any question whatever. I think it tenable ground to say that the Roman Catholics should not be admitted to the House at all; but to say we will admit Members into the House, into a deliberative Assembly, and to add that they should vote only on particular subjects, or if they did vote on others that they should vote only in a particular way, is to impose disabilities of a highly objectionable character. And then would arise the question, who were to be the judges of the questions which the Roman Catholics should be allowed to vote on? There would be great difficulty in this matter. There was an instance quoted the other night by the noble Lord the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard). The noble Lord said that many Members were of opinion that it was for the interest of the Church that church rates should be abolished; and, therefore, that hon. Members, notwithstanding the oath, might vote for their abolition. I am of a contrary opinion; and I think, therefore, that voting for the abolition of church rates would be a violation of that oath. But why should Roman Catholic Members be put in this position of doubt and perplexity? I say again, the Roman Catholic Member when he comes to this House ought to be able to give his vote on every subject that comes before the House. My hon. and learned Friend said that the oath had prevented Roman Catholic Members from voting on several occasions. But, if so, I say that is a reason for abolishing it. On a former occasion my hon. and learned Friend reminded the House that they were not imposing the oath for the first time. Well, that is an important admission. If it meant anything it meant that he would not insert the words in a new oath. But if the words — imposed under particular circumstances in 1829—were unreasonable or improper now, was that a reason why we should retain them? It is said that there was a compact in 1829. Well, I can understand that at that time the Roman Catholics were willing to come in on any terms. Persons for a long time barred out in the cold would not be unwilling to sit at the hospitable board within, even if they sat below the salt. But is it fair and generous to keep them to the terms of this bad bargain? I am prepared to place Roman Catholics on the footing of other Members by enabling them to vote on all subjects; and I shall, therefore, vote against the proposition of my hon. and learned Friend.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, it appears to me that the unmistakable tendency of public opinion in the last few years has been to meet the claims of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in a spirit of rational conciliation, and I ascribe that general tendency of public opinion to causes which, at the time, were calculated, I think, to lead us to believe that a very different result might be brought about. I attribute it to those circumstances popularly known as the "Papal aggression." At that time those who were then in the House will remember that what happened was really so misconceived, and I may be permitted, speaking historically, to add, so mismanaged by the Government of the day, that it did appear that there was a prospect before us of a prolongation of that religious rancour which it was the hope of the great majority of the nation had passed away. When the Prime Minister of the country appeared in his place in this House and informed us with all the authority of official responsibility that in the opinion of the Government there was a decided Papal conspiracy against the liberties of Europe, and that the ecclesiastical arrangements which had then taken place were part and parcel of that conspiracy, it appeared to us all that we were approaching a period of religious exasperation which would probably again disturb and darken society, for some time emancipating itself from that fatal influence. On the contrary, our expectations were happily disappointed. The result of that important event appears to have been exactly the contrary of what was expected. The result was really that it made the country much more tolerant than before; and that may be ascribed to this cause. There was so unmistakable a demonstration of Protestant feeling in England, a sentiment so profound, so fervent, and so extensive in favour of our Protestant institutions, that when the hubbub was over, and the excitement had subsided, there was a disposition to look on the claims of the Roman Catholics without distrust, to view them with candour, and to meet them in a spirit of conciliation. I believed at that time, and, from information which has reached me from many eminent members of the Roman Catholic persuasion, I believe now, that all that the great majority of the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland, really desired, and what they now desire, is that they should enjoy the full and free exercise of their religion. I believe that the Roman Catholics did not desire to obtain more; and I believe that the great body of their Protestant fellow-subjects did not desire to grant less. But, unfortunately, there are extreme parties on both sides. There is, Sir, an extreme Protestant party, and there is an extreme Roman Catholic party, and their views differ from the views which are, I believe, the convictions, opinions, and sentiments of the great majority of Her Majesty's subjects, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics. There is an extreme Protestant party who persist in believing that every Roman Catholic is a Jesuit. There is, on the other hand, an extreme Roman Catholic party who, the moment their aggressive indiscretion excites comment and perhaps a little distrust, immediately raise a howl that their Protestant fellow-countrymen wish to revive all the Roman Catholic disabilities. Now, if the opinions of either of these sections were predominant in this country the government of Her Majesty's dominions would be impossible. Fortunately, although noisy and bustling, they are limited in their influence, and the general sentiment of the country controls their violence and extravagance. What may be called the Gulf Stream of common-sense softens and subdues their violence and asperity. Hitherto we have succeeded—no doubt with some difficulty and with constant misrepresentation and misconception—but hitherto we have succeeded in supporting and realizing on both sides the policy which commenced in 1829, and which the general opinion of this country recognized as being sound, politic, and just. The violent section of the Roman Catholic party have always thought that they could advance their views by attacking the Established Church, and especially by attacking the Established Church in Ireland. I must, Sir, express my opinion, wishing to view the case in the same manner as an enlightened and patriotic member of the Roman Catholic party might do, that that is a very great error—I mean that it is a course which very much injures the advance of those views which have been on both sides recognized as just and desirable. If I might be permitted to view the question as a Roman Catholic Member, I should say that, being devoted to my religion, being anxious to obtain that full, fair, and free exercise of that religion which has been recognized by leading men of all parties and by the great majority of this House and of the country as just and desirable, no course could be taken more opposed to the fulfilment of this expectation than an attack on the Established Church of this country. Into the question of the Established Church in England I do not now wish to enter. I would speak of the Established Church in Ireland, and I will confine myself to that point. That Church underwent some thirty years ago, in the memory of many Members of this House, a very stern and severe revision. Its wealth, always exaggerated, was then much diminished, and when diminished was distributed in a manner which tended greatly to its increased utility and efficiency. I should remember that the Established Church in Ireland really rested upon the spiritual sympathies, if not of a majority of the country, still on the spiritual sympathies of a very considerable minority, not to be estimated by numbers merely or by being in strict communion with that Church, and I should remember also that that very numerous minority were distinguished by their intelligence, by their property, by their zeal, and by a firmness of character which is universally recognized. I should remember, also, that totally irrespective of those circumstances peculiar to Ireland, it is a fact that the Established Church in Ireland has never been seriously menaced by the Roman Catholics without exciting and developing in this country the latent sympathies of millions of the population, which proves how deeply and keenly they are interested in its maintenance. If I were the character I have contemplated—and it is not a rare one—I mean an enlightened Member of the Roman Catholic body, I would look at the question of the Irish Church apart from ecclesiastical and spiritual considerations; I would look at it both as a politician and a statesman. I should remember, in the first place, that if there be anything which the experience of the last thirty years has proved; if there be any conviction which all our debates, our investigations, our Commissions of Inquiry, and our prolonged discussions have demonstrated, it is this—that what you want in Ireland is to create and not to destroy. And, under these circumstances, how far would the advancement and improvement of Ireland be favoured, if, by subverting the Established Church the immediate result would be to withdraw the beneficial influence of a body of enlightened men spread over the country, distinguished, even by the admission of their opponents, for their piety and their active virtues? I would even press the case a little further, and I trust the Roman Catholic Members of the House will not find fault with me for doing so. I have no wish to insult their religion. On the contrary, I respect their ancient faith and the venerable see to which they defer. But I would ask them to recollect that thirty years ago Roman Catholicism made a partnership with modern Liberalism, the object of which was the destruction of the Established Church in Ireland. That compact and confederacy were carried on under the most favourable circumstances. In consequence of it they have virtually had the government of England during the last thirty years. They have, with scarcely an interval, dictated the policy of England, and greatly influenced the policy of Europe. And what has been the consequence of the alliance between Roman Catholicism and modern Liberalism on the Established Church in Ireland? The Established Church in Ireland still exists. It has suffered no diminution in its influence, or decrease in its strength. I may, without exaggeration, say that its moral authority has increased, and that those who minister to its offices are generally recognized as a body of men who for their piety and learning, and for the fulfilment of the higher and loftier purposes of existence, are not second to any body of clergy in the world. But, may I ask my Roman Catholic Colleagues in this House what has been the effect of the alliance upon another Church, and one possessing their affectionate devotion. I will not paint the consequences of that compact. I will leave them to the consciences of Roman Catholic Members. They are fresh in their memory. The result has been to all but destroy the temporal power, and in some degree endanger the spiritual authority of that ancient throne, the fall of which, for the sake of European peace and for considerations connected with this country is, I hold to be, regarded with apprehension. We know not the day that a telegram may not arrive announcing the fatal result of the policy adopted by the Roman Catholic population of this country for the destruction of the Established Church in Ireland. That being the view which a candid and enlightened Roman Catholic might be likely to take of this question, allow me to remind the House in what position Parliament was this year with reference to the Irish Church. We knew very well that an association had been formed in Ireland, the main object of which was the subversion of the Established Church in that country. It was founded by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the most eminent prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, both for talent and authority, presided over its first assembly. I may be told and have been told, and have heard with much satisfaction, that that meeting and that association were no evidence whatever of the feeling of the great Roman Catholic body. But I ask my Roman Catholic Colleagues in this House to put themselves in our position, and ascertain what their feelings would be if they found themselves in a situation somewhat analogous. Suppose there was an association in this country formed by the bench of bishops and presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and supported by parties in authority, which was to pass strong and vehement resolutions; that, in consequence of the undoubted progress of the Roman Catholic religion, it was necessary that we should revive the Roman Catholic disabilities. It might be shown to them that none of the influential men of the Tory party belonged to such association, yet they would say, "If your bishops originated and the Primate presided at a meeting which passed such resolutions it is impossible to deny that that was a meeting representing Protestant feeling in the country, and we must take measures to defend our own interests." And who would blame them? That, unfortunately, we know was the state of things when Parliament met. Then came a debate, still open, the subject of which is the subversion of the Established Church in Ireland. It was not certainly introduced by a Roman Catholic Member, but with the greatest consistency by an hon. Member (Mr. Dillwyn), who has a right to make Motions against all possible churches. Roman Catholic Members supported that Motion. I am sorry that they did so. I am astonished that such a thing should have happened, because it is impossible for us to be perfectly blind to the signs of the times in which we live. The signs of the times in which we live are not like the signs of the times thirty years ago, when compacts were entered into between Roman Catholics and Liberals for the destruction of the Established Church. The existing signs of the times are not favourable to internecine hostilities between Christian churches, and I should have thought that Roman Catholics would have hesitated to attack any Christian Church though such Church were not in communion with themselves. Under these circumstances, the right hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) has come forward and asked you to repeal the Roman Catholic oath. I entirely acquit the right hon. Gentleman of any sinister design. I am quite convinced, from what I know of his character, that whether this were the first or the last year of Parliament, and without reference to any political considerations, the right hon. Gentleman would have taken the first or the best opportunity that offered for submitting the question in which he is warmly interested to our consideration. It was perfectly competent for any hon. Gentleman to bring such a Motion forward. It has been raised in this House before, if not in the present, in the last Parliament, and the question is one which any hon. Gentleman, whatever his political or religious views, was justified at any time in bringing forward. Nor is it a question which any one who studies political life could suppose would not some day or other be brought under our consideration. Under these circumstances, Sir, we have to consider the course which we ought to take. I myself object to the Bill as originally brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman. I think it an error to have made such a Motion. The Roman Catholic oath, as it now exists, contains nothing which a gentleman might not take. No one will contend for a moment that it contains anything which a gentleman of the highest honour and the nicest feelings might not take. I can myself truly say that if I were a Roman Catholic I should never hesitate for a moment in taking that oath. Although I might prefer another form of oath, I could not find in the form of it as it now exists any obstacle to taking my seat in this House. We must remember this. My hon. Friend who has just addressed the House seems to think that the oath was carelessly accepted by the Roman Catholics at the time of the passing of the Emancipation Act without criticism or cavil because they were influenced by the great political result which they could only obtain on that condition. Now, I must say that does not appear to me an accurate statement of the circumstances of the case. I will not too strictly criticize the conduct of great political leaders like Mr. O'Connell or Mr. Sheil, who, with all the ardour of public life, might not have been very curious as to the terms on which they agreed to obtain so sovereign a result. But we must also look to the opinions of other men, and when I see one so distinguished for his purity of character, for his learning and high intelligence, and statesmanlike qualities as Archbishop Murray, I cannot agree that the grave advice given by Archbishop Murray corresponds with the spirit and sentiment attributed by my hon. Friend to the Roman Catholics who accepted this oath. You cannot interpret the public documents of an ancient country like England as you would the *à priori* documents of a new society reared in the backwoods. Every public document in this country—and of all public documents, oaths—must be of an historic character. The oath that the Roman Catholics now take was framed from other oaths drawn up in other Parliaments, and I believe even in Irish Parliaments. They refer to great historic events; and when you have had in an ancient country contending dynasties, conflicting churches, civil wars, it is totally impossible that in public documents you will not find expressions indicating events, no doubt sources of great sorrow and regret, to many gentlemen, especially to those who profess the Roman Catholic faith. But this may be said of the Roman Catholic gentry, not only of England but of Ireland, that there is nothing in these expressions that can bring shame upon them. We are indebted to the Roman Catholic gentry of the United Kingdom, as much as to any portion of the population of this country, both for having built up its liberties and having given illustrious instances of loyalty to their Sovereign. Sir, this is not the only objection I entertain to this matter being brought forward. It concerns a speculative and not a practical grievance; it is likely to create alarm, likely to create prejudice, and likely to prevent the passing of measures which might have been of practical advantage to the Roman Catholics. I object, also, to this measure having been brought forward by an individual Member. I think, when measures of this kind are proposed, they should not be brought forward by individual Members; but if they are brought forward by an individual Member, I think it most unfortunate they should be, as in this particular case, by an individual Member professing the Roman Catholic faith.

I think that imparts a considerable difficulty into our treatment of the subject, because you are not called upon by the right hon. Gentleman to decide between the existing oath and an uniform oath. That is a policy of a different character. The right hon. Gentleman asks us to decide between an oath that now exists and a re-constructed oath. What is the reconstruction? It consists greatly of omissions—omissions which might, under other circumstances, raise questions of controversy, whether they meant anything or nothing; but when a Roman Catholic Member suggests the re-construction of an oath and makes many omissions, the natural inference in the minds of the great body of the people who are not so learned in political life and history as ourselves, is, that there must be some object in these omissions, and that if the object is favourable to the Roman Catholics it is unfavourable to them. Under these circumstances they are naturally alarmed, and there is often much prejudice as well as sound objection favoured by such a course. I think, under these circumstances, it is much to be regretted that such a measure should have been brought forward by an individual Member in such a shape. I therefore come to the conclusion that if the Roman Catholic oath is to be altered, it ought not to be succeeded by another Roman Catholic oath—that it would be better to leave it as it is, with the idea of a grievance—I do not wish to depreciate it, but, after all, it is not a practical grievance—than that we should come forward again and propose that there shall be a separate oath for Roman Catholics as distinguished from the Protestant Members of this House. Sir, my hon. Friend who has just addressed us has stated that, in his opinion, there ought to be no oath at all, and this shows you the great difficulty of the subject with which we have to deal. When the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Monsell) begs us to re-construct the Roman Catholic oath we are entering upon a subject replete with difficulties, which demands our most mature and earnest consideration. And one point is, whether we should not have a declaration instead of an oath? I do not agree with my hon. Friend. I think that oaths ought to be as rare as they are solemn, but I believe that there are occasions — and the taking of a seat in this House is one of those solemn occasions—when the sanction of the Most High may be appealed to, not with irreverence, but with a due sense of the important duties which Members of Parliament are called upon to discharge. I think we should fall into a great error if we held out the idea in this age, when secular feeling is, I think, too much encouraged in the transactions of public life, that it is our business as much as possible to remove from the conduct of the highest public affairs the sanction of an oath. Another question has arisen in this discussion. The Secretary of State, who has addressed us, says that if there ought to be an oath it should be merely the oath of allegiance. But why, if this limited and utilitarian view of affairs is to be taken, should there be any oath at all? Some may doubt that the Throne would be less secure if there were no oath of allegiance. The Queen reigns in the affections of her subjects, and if we were all sitting here without taking the oath of allegiance I do not imagine we could diminish Her Majesty's authority. But the experience of mankind has taught us that the order and propriety of life are best consulted by the citizens of a State periodically declaring, on solemn occasions, their allegiance to the fundamental principles of their commonwealth and appealing to divine sanction—and I am not prepared to resist or oppose what I believe to be the consequence of the experience of mankind. But why should we take the oath of allegiance as proposed by the Secretary of State? The form of the oath of allegiance is mediæval. So long as these oaths were not disturbed, the oath of allegiance was one which we could take without any scruple, and in which we found the least difficulty. But if you are to frame new oaths—above all, if you are to prepare uniform oaths—the question may arise whether you should take the oath to an individual Sovereign or to the Constitution of the country. I do not see that we ought in a free country merely to take the oath of allegiance to the Sovereign. I believe we are also bound to take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. It seems to me there is something rather barbarous in the idea that all difficulties may be solved in a free country by merely taking the oath of allegiance to a Sovereign who acknowledges her authority to be limited, and whose proudest boast is that she rules by constitutional authority. I know when you come to the question of allegiance to the Constitution under which we live a difficulty arises, because part of that Constitution is the Church. I think on that subject there are considerable errors: some misunderstandings which it is desirable to remove, and difficulties which, after due deliberation and discussion, might disappear. We have a good many Churchmen in this House. We have a great many Motions made and a great many discussions in which the interests of the Church and the constitutional privileges of the Church are called in question, and I have contended, along with others, against any diminution of the political status of the Established Church in our constitutional system. But not because I believe in the phrase that is often thrown at our heads that "the Church is in danger." On the contrary, I hold that it is possible that all the Motions that are brought forward by Gentlemen below the gangway might be carried—that the alliance between Church and State might be terminated altogether, and yet that the power and influence and authority of the Church might not be diminished. Nay, if the Church retained her property—and the tenure by which it is held is of so complicated a character that confiscation would be more difficult than many persons imagined—I believe the power of the Church might be increased. But if that alliance were terminated, I ask what would become of the power of the State? I believe that would be greatly diminished not only in degree but in quality. And, Sir, it is not the Church that is in danger, but the State that is in danger by Motions which would lead to the great changes which some hon. Gentlemen desire. I cannot help believing that it is perfectly possible, without curtailing the full Parliamentary power of criticism over the institutions of the country, that an oath might be framed which every Member of this House, whatever may be his religion, might freely take, and which no loyal, sensible, and truly religious man would hesitate to take. These are reasons, among others, which show the immense difficulties of the questions that must arise before we can come to any matured legislation on this subject, and all these reasons tend to prove that to deal with these questions satisfactorily, and as becomes statesmen, is the duty and province of the responsible advisers of the Crown. I know that the responsible advisers of the Crown have said that they will not undertake it. It was once undertaken, in a certain degree, and they failed in that case, not from any of the difficulties which I have suggested, but because they attempted, by the re-constructing of oaths, by a side-wind to carry a measure which ought to have been carried in a direct manner, and by the omission of words which I, for one, will never consent to omit from any oath framed in this House. Under these circumstances, if the Cabinet of the Queen will not undertake the duty, there is what I may call the Cabinet of the House of Commons, and that is a Select Committee. When I asked Her Majesty's Government to give a morning sitting, in order that the debate might be carried on, not hurriedly, and at a late hour, it was my intention to have moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, with an instruction to that Committee to consider whether it was not practical to frame one uniform oath. But it was intimated to me by the highest authority that the question was in such a position that I could not consistently with our forms submit such a Motion to the House, therefore the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman has taken its course, and it is in Committee to-night. How are we to deal with it? I repeat my objection that I very much regret the attempt to frame another Roman Catholic oath. I think it would have been better for the Roman Catholics, I think it would have been better for the country generally, that the existing oath should be left untouched until the matter had been dealt with in a more comprehensive manner. But the House has by repeated majorities otherwise decided, and therefore I am obliged to consider how far I can meet the just claims of the Roman Catholics on this subject. The oath has been stated with great succinctness by my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns). I will not admit that the language in the existing oath is a reproach. If it were so, I would not for a moment oppose its omission. I think this feeling on the part of Roman Catholics is rather of a morbid character. There are gentlemen, indeed, who have written to me that the bull *Cœnæ Domini* is still in existence, and I believe the Pope never repeals his bulls; and they fear some terrible calamity hanging over the country in the shape of the Roman canon law, from which I myself have certainly never experienced as yet any evil consequences. But we must look at all these points historically, and as men of the world. Granting that the bull *Cœnæ Domini* is still in existence—granting that it is part of the Roman canon law, and may be the law of a portion of the Roman Catholic diocese of Westminster, I cannot help remembering that during the greater part of this century, if not before, there have existed the most confidential and friendly relations between the Court of Rome and the Sovereigns of this country, who hold the Crown by a Protestant tenure. I cannot forget that there have been between these Powers respectively good offices and expressions of obligation on both sides. I cannot forget the expressions of gratitude, in the handwriting, not of the present, but of a recent Pope, towards the English Sovereign who contributed to the restoration of his power and his estates. When I know all these things, how can I be so much frightened as I might otherwise have been, and perhaps ought to be, by the bull *Cœnœ Domini?* I have no objection to certain alterations in the oath. If it displeases Roman Catholics to be accused indirectly of equivocation—which, by the way, every Protestant gentleman six years ago submitted to, and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, I am told, even to this day, takes an oath containing the same language—by all means let the words be omitted. But when I am asked to consent to omit the language which my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns) proposes to re-insert, I find that a much graver matter. If you ask me whether I believe that the Established Church—and even the Established Church in Ireland—depends for its strength and its security upon any oath that can be taken in any place, I candidly confess that, were that so, I should have very little confidence in the future of the Established Church of this country. I do not think the Established Church in England depends upon that oath, nor do I think that the Established Church in Ireland depends upon it. The latter is sometimes spoken of as a weak Institution and in peril. Now I think it a strong Institution, and do not consider it in peril; and I have no doubt, from the causes which I have intimated, that the Established Church in both countries will continue to exist, will flourish, and will increase in authority and influence. But if you ask me what will be the consequence at this time—looking at the Motions that are made in this House, at the associations that are formed in Ireland, at the feeling prevalent throughout the country—if you ask me what will be the consequence of Parliament coming forward at this time and agreeing to the omission of language which was formerly introduced into these documents for the purpose, if not of defending the Church, of at least showing that the Parliament of England resolves to recognize its authority and maintain it, I say that I believe it would be most unhappy and disastrous, and especially to the Roman Catholics themselves. I believe such a course would be more calculated to revive the acrimonious religious discussions, which it has been our policy for a quarter of a century to put an end to—to lead to exacerbation of feeling on religious matters—and to give authority to the unfounded statements that are made with regard to the conduct of Roman Catholics generally throughout the country, than any other course that we could pursue. Under these circumstances, I have no hesitation as to the course which I ought to pursue. I shall support my hon. and learned Friend in the introduction of the words which he has proposed; and I do so, not because I suppose the introduction of the words necessary to the maintenance of the Church—next to the Throne the strongest Institution in the country—but because I believe that if there be a general opinion that Parliament has renounced its allegiance to the Established Church in this country there will be such a sentiment of alarm, and perhaps of indignation, that the policy which I have always supported and still wish to support—namely, the meeting the just claims of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in a spirit of rational conciliation—will be greatly obstructed and endangered.

Sir GEORGE GREY: Sir, upon the second reading of this Bill I stated at some length the opinion of the Government, and, therefore, I shall only trouble the House now with very few observations. And, in doing so, I shall not follow the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) into those topics which he has introduced into the discussion, and which, I think, only tend to divert us from the plain and simple issue which we have before us. The right hon. Gentleman has raised questions about the expediency of maintaining the temporal power of the Pope, and as to the effects of disunion of Church and State—questions of great importance, but out of place, I think, on the present occasion. Neither will I go into the question raised by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt), whether we should not be wise in abolishing all oaths and substitute for them declarations. That, again, is a question deserving consideration on a fitting occasion, but not raised by the Bill before us. The real question is—are our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects preferring a claim which can properly and reasonably be made by members of that church? They urge a claim to seats in this House on terms of perfect equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects; and the question we have to decide is, whether good cause has been shown for granting those claims. With the remark made by the right hon. Gentleman as to the different spirit in which questions of this kind are treated now from what they would have been some years ago, I entirely concur. In 1854 the Government of Lord Aberdeen proposed to Parliament a Bill, the effect of which would have been to establish one uniform oath, precisely in the form now suggested by the Bill of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell), but that Bill was opposed, and successfully opposed, by the right hon. Gentleman and the great party of which he is the head. In the year 1859 a Bill, identical, I believe, to the letter, with that now proposed by my right hon. Friend, was introduced by the right hon. Gentleman at that time Attorney General for Ireland, now Mr. Justice Fitzgerald; and parties were so evenly balanced that leave to introduce the Bill was only granted by a small majority. That Bill, again, was opposed by the right hon. Gentleman and the whole of his party. Now, Sir, what do we see? The Bill proposed by my right hon. Friend has had its principle affirmed in two divisions by majorities in each case of about seventy. And, more than this, we find that those who refused on the former occasions to sanction any alteration in the Roman Catholic oath, now freely admit that there are parts of that oath which it is desirable to expunge, and they limit their opposition merely to the omission of those parts of the oath which are embodied in the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns). I think we may certainly hail this result of the discussion as a proof that questions of this kind are entertained in a spirit of greater fairness and moderation, and with greater Christian charity than on former occasions. As to the apprehension expressed by the right hon. Gentleman at the close of his speech, that if the words relating to the settlement of property and the maintenance of the Established Church in Ireland be omitted from the oath, a strong feeling may be excited in the country which will possibly prove injurious to Roman Catholics, let me remind him of the fact to which I adverted on the second reading of the Bill. No one can doubt the attachment to Protestantism of the Protestant Dissenters, or suspect them of any sympathy with the doctrines of the Church of Rome, yet they have petitioned that this Bill may pass, considering that the principle embodied in it is just and reasonable. And now we come to the point really at issue—namely, the retention of the words, maintaining the settlement of property, and the declaration that Roman Catholic Members will not attempt to subvert the Protestant Established Church. It is needless for me to repeat the argument that the oath does not contain any real defence of the Established Church. The right hon. Gentleman plainly conceded that, in his opinion, it does not constitute any such defence; though he seems to imply that in the minds of other persons it might be so considered, and that its abolition might excite feelings detrimental to the Roman Catholics themselves. I think they may well take their chance of any such feeling arising. Will anybody seriously contend that the retention of this oath is of any advantage to the Established Church or to the Protestant faith in this country? I stated before, that in my opinion the oath is unnecessary and ambiguous, and that was a reason why, at all events, it should be modified. No one has attempted to deny that a portion of the oath is ambiguous in its terms; that different interpretations may be put upon it, and therefore that it does not operate in the manner in which persons who are anxious to retain the oath desire that it should do. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman, when he spoke of an alliance between the extreme sections of the Liberal party and Roman Catholic Members for the subversion of the Established Church in Ireland, had his attention directed to the fact that, not very long after the passing of the Act requiring the present oath, Lord Derby, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, introduced the Church Temporalities Bill, which not only reduced the number of archbishops and bishops, but interfered materially with the temporalities of the Irish Church. I never heard that any reproach attached to the Roman Catholic Members for supporting Lord Derby in passing that Bill by large majorities. Other questions have since arisen; but the terms of the oath mainly go to this—that Roman Catholic Members shall not use their power for the subversion of the Established Church, and it is clear that the Church Temporalities Act could neither have been proposed by the Government nor understood by the House as a subversive measure. As regards the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), I say nothing. He is a member of the Church of England; but his Motion, undoubtedly, received the support of some Roman Catholic Members. As to questions upon which Roman Catholic Members are to vote or not, I say a man's own conscience can be the only guide in the interpretation of the oath. Some men will take different views of the obligations imposed upon them from those entertained by others; but we have no right to doubt that they will act conscientiously in obedience to an oath open, as I have already stated, to different constructions. If the oath is open to this ambiguous construction, that is a reason why it should not be maintained. The right hon. Gentleman desires to see one uniform oath established for all Members of Parliament. I hope this may soon be accomplished; but what he added about the difficulty of framing one uniform oath showed how inexpedient it would have been for my right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell) to forego the advantages he has gained by the position in which his Bill now is, in order that another Bill might be introduced for establishing one uniform oath. If this Bill passes, the oaths taken by Protestant and by Roman Catholic Members will be so very similar that I cannot conceive it possible that we shall not soon come to an uniform oath. But insert the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman and you raise an insuperable barrier against the attainment of that object. Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that he would impose on Protestant Dissenters the same oath which he wishes Roman Catholic Members to take—that they will not attempt to subvert the Established Church? If not, the insertion of those words is a declaration that you will not have a uniform oath; that you propose to perpetuate the distinction—a distinction to which you attach no value, and which is no security to the Established Church. It is these useless distinctions we wish now to abolish. For these reasons I think it inexpedient to adopt the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns). I believe the best thing you can do, under present circumstances, is to pass the Bill as proposed by my right hon. Friend, reserving for future consideration the question of whether you will have an uniform oath. Towards the attainment of that object I believe this Bill is an important step, and I hope it will eventually insure that result.

Mr. WHITESIDE: Sir, to the debate of 1854 the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey), I think, has unintentionally made an erroneous reference. The Conservative party, as he has accurately stated, defeated the very bad Bill then proposed. But why? Because a number of Gentlemen who sat behind the Ministers, finding out the attempt that was made to overthrow the Act of Supremacy, which asserted the jurisdiction of the Crown in all matters and things ecclesiastical and temporal, although willing enough to pass a measure that avoided that subject, the moment they discovered the great and fundamental interference with our ancient laws contemplated by that Bill voted against the right hon. Gentleman. The Conservative party acted on that occasion in accordance with their principles, and not only maintained the Articles of the Church but upheld the interpretation which every great lawyer has always put upon the Constitutional law of the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) the other night asked what he, no doubt, considered a very awkward question—whether I believed the oath which I had taken. He put that question triumphantly. He had just then returned from his rustic meditations, and I think my right hon. Friend must have been engaged either in the composition of a beautiful poem or in writing a piece of biography, since he failed to apprehend the principles of the Constitution of his country. The word to which his question pointed was "jurisdiction." If he had bestowed a moment's thought upon it he would have remembered that "jurisdiction" was the word employed in the Articles of the Church, where it is distinctly stated that "the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction within the realm of England," a declaration justified by the opinion of every lawyer who has written on the subject. I will give him a scrap from Sir Matthew Hale, because I should not like my right hon. Friend to suffer under the unhappy notion that the oath which he has taken was not founded on fact. Sir Matthew Hale says—

> "The supremacy of the Crown in matters ecclesiastical is a most unquestionable right of the Crown of England, that there had been encroachments made by the Papacy under that loose pretence *in ordine spiritualia*, and these had gained great strength, notwithstanding the security which the Crown had by the oath of fealty and allegiance, and required to be unriveted by the power of Parliament."

The Bill of 1854, to which the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey) referred, covertly and in a very sly manner proposed to get rid of the Oath of Supremacy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a very clever speech on that occasion; endeavouring to set aside the principle of the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters. I believe many persons in this country of a peculiar cast of mind and of peculiar opinions would be very glad to do so. I shall now quote a few opinions of eminent authorities and distinguished men on this subject. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud would be satisfied with that of Lord Lyndhurst. Lord Lyndhurst said that the—

> "Supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters was part of the common law, part of the Constitution of the country."

Nor do I think he will disapprove that of a former Lord Chief Justice. It was as follows:—

> "The declaration contained in the oath of Supremacy is but the affirmance of a proposition which is logically and politically true as an essential principle of independent Sovereignty."

These were the words of Lord Ellenborough.

MR. HORSMAN: Why not give Lord Chelmsford's opinion?

MR. WHITESIDE: I prefer to give what suits me. To speak seriously, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Horsman), on the occasion to which I have referred, surprised me. I did not believe that any gentleman in England, particularly any one who, like my right hon. Friend, belongs, as I believe, to the Church of England, could imagine that an oath framed in the terms of the Oath of Supremacy could be taken by Members of Parliament not believing it to be true. As my right hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) said, these oaths have an historic meaning and an historic character, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud expresses a doubt as to whether the oath taken by the Protestant Members of this House can be truly taken, he must allow me to remind him that it was not on the question of transubstantiation that the oath was framed, but the great debate and the great dispute was as to the supremacy of the Pope of Rome or the Crown of England, and loyal Catholics in taking the oath took it honestly and conscientiously. Therefore, I believe the right hon. Gentleman will never again ask me the question whether I can take the oath believing it to be true. I venture to assert that if my right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) had brought in a Bill directly doing away with the supremacy of the Crown he would have involved himself in a debate which would not have finished by the end of August, because this is a subject not to be got rid of in a cursory manner; it is one upon which whole essays have been written, and upon which the great sages of the law have instructed us. The oath to which this Bill refers is said to be offensive. Now, there are two or three Gentlemen, Friends of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who have given opinions on this subject, and no person knows better than the right hon. Gentleman that the opinions of Gentlemen who change their politics lose much of their value. Not only did the late Sir Robert Peel declare that he had drawn up the oath as a compact—[Mr. HORSMAN: No, no!] I say, yes. Sir Robert Peel, in 1849 said—and this supports the view taken by my right hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli)—that it might be taken by a man of the nicest sense of honour. Sir Robert Peel said—

> "The law has provided an oath, to be taken by the Roman Catholic, which qualifies him to take his seat in either branch of the Legislature. That same oath, to which the Roman Catholic has no conscientious scruples and takes without the slightest difficulty, which was formed that he might take it without difficulty, gives him, with respect to civil offices, as well as to Parliament, a clear and unquestionable qualification."—[3 *Hansard*, cv. 431.]

These are the words of Sir Robert Peel, and I therefore think the interruption of my right hon. Friend was unnecessary. And then there is the opinion of Lord John Russell. Now, Lord John Russell changed his opinion afterwards—of course he did; it is the fashion of the day. But Lord John Russell, replying to a proposal to change something in the Roman Catholic oath, on the question before the House, said—

> "He did not think it would be wise to disturb a settlement which had been made after so many conflicts and so much consideration, and which, as he had understood, the Roman Catholics had supported as a full and complete admission of

their claim to sit in Parliament."—[3 *Hansard*, cv. 439.]

And, again—

> "If they took the shorter form of that oath and substituted it for the Roman Catholic oath, as settled in 1829, they would be taking away"—

What is the expression of Lord Russell?

> "the foundation of that settlement, to which many Members would also object."—[3 *Hansard*, *Ibid* p. 440.]

But that is not all. Mr. Goulburn, in 1854, said—

> "He was the only Member in the House who was a Member of the Duke of Wellington's Cabinet in 1829, and who was a party with the late Duke in framing the oath which now stood in the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. When the measure was proposed by the noble Duke it was more ample and freer from restrictions than any which the friends of the Roman Catholics had previously proposed to the House; and all the restrictions previously sanctioned by Plunket and Grattan were studiously omitted from the Bill, the Duke of Wellington being willing, relying upon the good faith and honour of the Roman Catholics, to waive all objections felt to their entering the House so long as they swore to the form of oath then proposed. From that time to the present he had, in common with the late Sir Robert Peel and with all the Members of the Wellington Cabinet, distinctly refused to concur in any measure which should interfere with that great compact which was then entered into. He warned the House, and, above all, his fellow-countrymen of the Roman Catholic persuasion, to beware how they lent their efforts to the introduction of the first step towards the violation of the compact then entered into. Such a course would, he thought, tend to inflame the passions of the people, and possibly endanger the substantial provisions of that Bill of 1829, which had been found to be so beneficial to the country at large, and produce such an amount of religious discord throughout the country as it would be vain to attempt to repress."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxxiii. 970.]

That was the argument of a Gentleman who had been a party to the framing of the oath, and what, then, does the House think of the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud, that the oath was forced upon a reluctant minority by an overpowering majority? Now, where is his authority for that statement? Let him produce it, and I will undertake to convince the Roman Catholic Gentlemen of this House that the Roman Catholics themselves were the persons who drew up the substantive part of the oath. How did they draw it up? My right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) alluded to the evidence of Archbishop Murray before the House of Lords in 1825. In answer to the question whether there was any intention on the part of Gentlemen of the Roman Catholic persuasion to meddle with the property of the Established Church, he said, "Not at all;" and added that there was not the least objection on their part to make a declaration that they would not attempt to divert the property of the Established Church to the uses of their own church. Now, what did Archbishop Murray do, he kept his word? He returned to Ireland, and, together with the other bishops of his church, drew up a declaration which I will ask hon. Gentlemen who are opposed to the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns) to compare with that Amendment. In the declaration signed by the Roman Catholic bishops in 1826, they declare they will defend the settlement of property in this country as established by the laws now in being; that they abjure any intention to subvert the Church Establishment for the purpose of endowing their own Church; and that they will not use any privilege to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government. These were the words of the document which was signed by Archbishop Murray, and by every Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland; and hence it was that Archbishop M'Hale, the only surviving one, had point blank refused to join that association in Dublin, by whatever name it called itself, which had for its object the subversion of the Church of Ireland, and to plunge the country into confusion. The Roman Catholic bishops "declare that they will defend the settlement of property in this country as established by the laws then in being;" and these are the very words introduced by the authority of the late Sir Robert Peel into this oath. The next thing they said was that they abjured any intention to subvert the Established Church for the purpose of introducing any other in its stead; and they also declared that they would never make use of any privilege of which they might be possessed to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government of this country. Therefore the very words of their declaration were the words which were introduced into this oath by Sir Robert Peel. You find, therefore, Sir Robert Peel speaking of the agreement then come to as a compact; Mr. Goulburn calling it a compact, and Earl Russell speaking of it as a fundamental settlement. And these are the words which are now described as most offensive to every Roman Catholic Gentleman in this House. Now, I always prefer to be fortified by the opinions of the most eminent Roman Catholics. I do not study canon law much myself, because I do not like it. As to the words about the settlement of property, the late Sir Frankland Lewis put a question to the Professor of Canon Law at Maynooth, wishing to know whether there was any law by which the property of the Church in Ireland could be taken from her. The answer of the learned professor was that there was a law of limitation by which Church property, even in Rome, which had been out of the possession of the Church for 100 years, could not be claimed by the Church, and that there was no law, human or divine, which could justify an interference with Church property in Ireland. Mr. O'Connell, in his evidence before Parliament, entered into a learned dissertation upon the Act of Settlement, which deserves the attention of Roman Catholic Gentlemen, because it was drawn up in their favour. The head of their Church in Ireland, I observe, when censuring Mr. Justice Keogh the other day for his lecture on Milton, said something about Oliver Cromwell, who was a very distinct and terrible character. Now, observe, Oliver Cromwell destroyed your Church, and he and the Puritans, as far as they could, meant to extirpate your race. Your nobility were wanderers over the continent of Europe. They were stripped of their property, their fortunes, and their rank ; and the Puritan was the first person who ever expelled the Roman Catholic gentry of Ireland from their Parliament. Oliver Cromwell said they were not fit to sit in Parliament, and I should like to know who could contradict Oliver Cromwell? Who restored them? Those who believed in the Established Church. The Duke of Ormond, Charles II., and the Act of Settlement restored them. And now you, the Roman Catholic Members, are surrounding yourselves with the political descendants of the Puritans, who would destroy my Church and yours afterwards. I congratulate you on the union. In the Act of Settlement your Roman Catholic nobility and gentry, to the number of upwards of 100 are named, and by its instrumentality Churchmen restored them to their fortunes, estates, and titles without further inquiry, and they took the place to which they were entitled in the Parliament of their country. But the same law restored the property of the Church that had been torn from it in evil times. Now, I should like to know this. Do you hold it to be just and conscientious to form an association to upset a portion of an Act of Parliament which gave you your property? What objection is there to preserve in this oath the declaration which was recommended in substance by Mr. O'Connell himself, and which in the words I have read was suggested by Archbishop Murray and the Roman Catholic bishops. If I were asked, "Why do you rely so much on the other words, and what objection have you to take out these words relating to the Church?" I would answer by giving four conclusive reasons. The first reason is the publication of Earl Russell's new edition of his book on the *British Constitution.* In his preliminary essay he holds out the prospect of another appropriation clause. His triumph was so great on a former occasion that the noble Earl intimates to certain sections of the Liberal party, "if you join me in attacking the property of the Church in Ireland we may accomplish something for general purposes hereafter." The noble Earl's statements on the property of the Church in Ireland are a mere series of fictions. He says that the property of the Primate, if well laid out, would produce £180,000 a year, whereas I find his income is only £8,000, and for the first year the charges were £12,000. The income of the Bishop of Cork, so far from reaching the amount stated by the noble Earl, is under £2,000 a year. The noble Earl ought to have gone to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners before he published a new edition of his book, and asked them for the facts. My next reason is the letter of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), who, with that frankness and simplicity characteristic of him, says, if I am asked to join your association in Dublin, I will do so on two grounds. One is to overthrow the property of the Church, and the other to overthrow the laws regulating the settlement of property, and among them the absurd law of primogeniture. My third reason is the programme of that association to which I have referred, setting forth their desire to overthrow the Church, in the way of which desire many speakers and writers in Ireland have truly stated this oath is a very unpleasant obstruction. In the last debate I thought I heard the hon. Member for Louth use the words that this oath ought to be removed in order to unlock the mouths of Irish gentlemen, and let them loose at that great nuisance—the Established Church. [Mr. KENNEDY: I said to unmuzzle the senators.] The hon. Member is correct, I said "unlock," which is not so poetical, and I accept the hon. Member's term, and I say that, being a Churchman, if I can keep you muzzled I will do so. You made an arrangement fairly, and you have kept it honourably. I could name a Gentleman in this House—the hon. Baronet who represents Dundalk

(Sir George Bowyer)—whose scrupulous sense of honour, whenever the property of the Church of Ireland has been discussed, has prevented him from uttering one word in derogation of the solemn obligation which he has incurred by the oath. The last of my reasons is the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the Irish Church. That was a speech that ought never to be forgotten. During the short time I was absent in Dublin a gentleman of opposite politics to myself said, "We have found our man; we have got our leader." I said, "And who is to be your leader?" He replied, with the greatest frankness, "The Chancellor of the Exchequer; he has promised to deal with the Church of Ireland." I say that was a mischievous speech, and combined with the other circumstances I have mentioned, and with the feeling of a portion of the public press in Ireland, I object to dispense with an oath that is sought to be got rid of, not only to "unmuzzle" those whom it muzzles, but to enable a combined attack to be made by the enemies of the Church upon an Institution which they undertook not to disturb. I have been startled during these discussions to hear the light way in which oaths have been spoken of. It is a dangerous doctrine when applied to an oath such as this, drawn up by eminent statesmen of the Conservative party. The Duke of Wellington recorded his opinion that, whether the security were great or small, it was entered into for the satisfaction of the Protestant mind of the country, and was one of the conditions on which the Emancipation Act was passed. The right hon. Richard Anthony Blake, the Chief Remembrancer, the friend of a distinguished Irishman, the Marquess of Wellesley, gave evidence before the House of Lords in favour of the maintenance of the Established Church in Ireland, and being called upon to explain that evidence, he said—

> "The Protestant Church is rooted in the Constitution. It is established by the fundamental laws of the realm. It is rendered, as far as solemn Acts of the Legislature can be rendered, fundamental and perpetual. It is so declared by the Act of Union, and I think it could not now be subverted without danger to the general securities we possess for liberty, property, and order."

Believing, Sir, as I do, that the Established Church of Ireland is a security for order, peace, and prosperity, I will resist the removal of obstacles to those who tell me beforehand with perfect frankness that they mean to overthrow the Church. If I am asked what is the meaning of this oath, I ask in return whether any Member in this House will stand up and say that it was intended that those who took it should join together for the overthrow of the Church? The oath was framed in order that the settlement of property, so far as regards the Church, might be undisturbed. That settlement was overthrown in the short reign of James II.; it was afterwards restored; since then it has been from time to time disputed; and these words in the oath are of historic significance. Because they were fairly and properly introduced into the Emancipation Act; because they were suggested at the time by the Roman Catholic prelates themselves; because they do not hurt the conscience; because they do not offend the most scrupulous delicacy of sentiment or feeling in the mind of any Gentleman in this House; and lastly, because they assert a principle which is right, and just, and true, I heartily support the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend.

MR. HENLEY: Sir, I voted for the second reading of this Bill, but I had not an opportunity then of stating why I did so, and therefore I trust the House will allow me to state the course I intend to take at the present moment. The Home Secretary says he objects to the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns), because he thinks the Roman Catholic Members ought to be here upon a footing of perfect equality with all other Members. He laid down that as the broad basis upon which he was founding his vote. My hon. Friend below me (Mr. Hunt) said he would be no party to continuing a distinction in the oath, and therefore he would not vote for the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend. But, supposing that this Motion be not carried, I ask whether we should stand upon a footing of perfect equality? No man can say that we should. In the first four lines of the oath, both Roman Catholics and Protestants swear affirmatively to four things; they swear to do allegiance, to disclose any traitorous designs, to support the Succession to the Throne, and to support the Dignity of the Crown. Now, when you come to discuss these matters as casuists it is difficult to say, looking to the common-law theories as to the Dignity of the Crown, which includes its Supremacy, how far the oath can be taken affirmatively by persons who, when they come to the negations, stop short of this. But then comes the difference. We Protestants declare that no foreign Prince, Prelate, or Potentate has any jurisdiction of any sort or description in these realms. The Roman Catholic, I believe, do not, and cannot conscientiously make this declaration. We use words which are larger than those he can employ, and which embrace every possible contingency. Do we, then, stand in the position of equality spoken of by the Home Secretary? I say we do not. Then what is the position? The Roman Catholics form, say, a fifth part of the subjects of these realms. They are affiliated to the great body of Christians out of the country. They possess an organization made more perfect within these last few years, and growing more perfect every day. Under these circumstances, when this country consents to let the Roman Catholics take an obligation short of what we take — because that is the real fact, it is of no use disguising it—it is an obligation less in amount than that under which we come—is it unreasonable, as they do not wish to stand on the same ground as we do, to say, "Give us an assurance that you do not want to use this power to damage the Protestant Church in this country?" I think this is not unreasonable; and I never understood that it was felt to be unreasonable at the time it was agreed upon. Whether it affords a great or a small security is to me of no consequence. If the words will be a great security to the Church we ought, looking at the increased attacks on the Established Church, to retain those words; if they are a small security I should still be unwilling to give them up. I cannot shut my eyes to the change in the position of this country from what it was when this agreement was come to. We cannot say that the Roman Catholic Church is less completely organized, less powerful, or less aggressive than it then was. Can we say that the attacks on the Established Church have diminished? Before 1829 or 1830 these attacks were almost unknown. For a few years after that period they were very much pressed. In 1844, 1845, and 1846 they were pressed again, especially by the noble Earl now Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Earl Russell); and now these attacks are cropping up once more. Is this a time to give up that which may be a great or a small security for the maintenance of the Establishment? I, for one, am not willing to do so. I have a strong opinion, shared by the great majority of the country, as to the great blessings we derive from the maintenance of the Established Church, and I will not give up anything which I believe may be a security to the Church. The Home Secretary said the oath was an ambiguous one. If so, why do not those who think as he does propose a form of words which shall be an equivalent for these, and which shall not be ambiguous? But the fact is that they want to get rid of these words altogether. I voted for the second reading of the Bill for the following reason:—In 1858, I think, the forms of oath we take were generally re-cast. In re-casting that oath the declaration as to the lawfulness of murdering ex-communicated Sovereigns was got rid of out of the oath we take, though it was retained in the Roman Catholic oath. I thought it might be felt unfair to insist that this declaration should be made by Roman Catholics, and I wished to get rid of that. I was also quite willing to get rid of the jurat, which I always thought might be deemed offensive. These considerations induced me to vote for the second reading of the Bill. But the part of the oath we are now considering is of substance; and I, therefore, readily support the introduction of these words, believing that they are of some use for the security of the Established Church, and being sure that great alarm will be felt throughout the country if we consent to give them up.

MR. HORSMAN: Sir, having had an opportunity of stating my opinions to the House at some length on a former occasion, it did not occur to me that I should take any part in this debate. But the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) has made so severe an attack upon me for my ignorance of history, he has convicted me of such gross errors of fact, and has covered me with so much confusion, that I feel constrained to vindicate myself. Part of that vindication will be an appeal to the House to join with me in requesting the right hon. Gentleman to set me that example which is more valuable than a whole volume of eloquent precept. Fortunately, we have an historical record of whatever statements we make in Parliament, and we are thus on either side brought to a test from which there is no escape. In passing I may say that when I spoke the other day of the jurisdiction of the Pope in this country, I stated that one of our difficulties was that there were so many different constructions put upon it by different authorities that it puzzled those who had to take the oath to know what it meant. The right hon. Gentleman has given me the authority of Lord Ellenborough and Lord Lyndhurst. Well, I could have given him many other authorities equally eminent and conclusive. I satisfied myself, however, by giving one which was peculiarly deserving of the respect of the right hon. Gentleman, because it was the opinion of a noble Lord who was Chancellor when the right hon. Gentleman was Attorney General for Ireland—I mean Lord Chelmsford. But the right hon. Gentleman said that he only quoted the authorities which suited his own convenience. The question is this:—The Act of Emancipation has been described as a compact between the Roman Catholics and the Government of that day. I deny that. I assert that there was no compact, that none was avowed, that none was implied, and I say that Sir Robert Peel went out of his way to repudiate any such compact. In order to make the history of this period clear to the right hon. Gentleman, allow me to recall to his recollection one fact. Hon. Members opposite take their stand on the Act of 1829. What was the principle and policy of that Act. By their speeches this evening, hon. Members opposite are repudiating the principle and thwarting the policy of the Act. I will prove what I say by quotations. In appealing to the venerated authority of Sir Robert Peel (you must recollect that we are not speaking of the Sir Robert Peel of 1850, whose memory we so much revere), but of the Sir Robert Peel of 1829, who was no friend to the principle of Catholic Emancipation, but who avowed he yielded to fear what he denied to justice. Only a few years before—in 1825—he tendered his resignation to Lord Liverpool because he was in a minority on the question of Catholic Emancipation in this House. In 1827 he refused to join the Cabinet of Mr. Canning; and why? You will remember Mr. Canning's memorable words when he said of the Catholic claims, "In the name of expediency they are politic; in the name of humanity they are charitable; in the name of God they are just;" and Sir Robert Peel asked how he could take office with Mr. Canning after he had given expression to such sentiments as those. Again, in 1828 Sir Robert Peel stated that further consideration had only confirmed him in opposition to the principle of Catholic Emancipation. In that year Sir Robert Peel was so little advanced in his opinions that he opposed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, as proposed by Lord John Russell. In 1829, however, Sir Robert Peel was a convert to the expediency of granting Catholic Emancipation. He was a man of sagacious and generous temperament, and when he determined to yield he determined that the concession should be large, generous, and effective. Sir Robert Peel, in introducing the Catholic Emancipation Bill, anticipated the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and laid down principles from which he was determined that there should be no departure. The first principle which he laid down was that the Act should accomplish perfect equality between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the Legislature. Sir Robert Peel said—

> "If we are to relinquish the system of exclusion, let us secure the advantages of concession. If we are to settle the Catholic question, let us settle it at once and for ever."

[*Cheers from the Opposition Benches.*] I have often known hon. Gentlemen cheer too soon, and I would now advise them to wait a little—

> "Settle it, I mean," continued Sir Robert Peel, "so far as political rights are concerned, by the restoration of equality."—[2 *Hansard.* xx. 757.]

Sir Robert Peel had to carry out this principle of equality, but the difficulty of Sir Robert Peel may be illustrated by the position of the right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) this evening. He had to mediate between conflicting passions—the passions of Roman Catholics on one side, who cried out "No exclusion," and the passions of those who cried out "No surrender!"—and he framed this oath. The right hon. Member for Buckinghamshire says that, as far as concerns the security of the Established Church, he does not care a rush for it; but there are those behind him who take a different view. Sir Robert Peel was obliged to make this compromise in order to conciliate the men opposed to the measure. That was the position of Sir Robert Peel in 1829, but he determined that a future age should be emancipated from the difficulty in which he was placed. He foresaw that people would say, "Here is a compact;" and here is the manner in which he repudiates such an assumption—

> "It is the result of no compact with any party or with any individual. The Roman Catholics have not been consulted in respect to it; and for two sufficient reasons. First, because it is better suited to the dignity of legislation that it should be independent of previous compacts with the parties whom it is to affect; and, secondly, because it is not fair upon the Roman Catholics themselves to require them to give their previous assent to the conditions, or securities, or restrictions with which it may be necessary to accompany the measures of relief."—[2 *Hansard,* xx. 755.]

Will the right hon. Gentleman say after

that that this is a matter of compact with the Roman Catholics, when Sir Robert Peel declared that he studiously avoided anything like compact, in order not to interfere with the future action of the Roman Catholics? He foresaw that the measure he was framing must be imperfect, and therefore he laid down the principle on which a future generation might act, though he was too much enthralled to act upon them himself. Sir Robert Peel not only said that there was no compact, but he anticipated the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, because he said that part of the intention of the Government was that no restriction should be placed on the speeches or votes of Roman Catholic Members. Is that denied? If I understand the Amendment, it means that the Roman Catholic Members are under the obligation of an oath which restrains them from taking part either in debates or divisions on the question of the Irish Church. If that is not the meaning of the Amendment it has no meaning at all. Now, Sir Robert Peel, with great foresight, saw and cut that ground from under your feet. That very restriction was proposed to Sir Robert Peel, and what were the terms with which he rejected and repudiated it? This is part of history, in which I am ignorant, and the right hon. Gentleman is so extremely conversant. Sir Robert Peel said —

"Another proposal has been made, by a right hon. Friend of mine, (Mr. Wilmot Horton) made from the best motives, and supported with an ingenuity, ability, and research worthy of the motives and of the character of its author. My right hon. Friend has proposed, with a view to calm the suspicions and fears of those who object to the admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament, that the Roman Catholic Member should be disqualified by law from voting on matters relating, directly or indirectly, to the interests of the Established Church. There appears to me numerous and cogent objections to this proposal. In the first place, it is dangerous to establish the precedent of limiting by law the discretion by which the duties and functions of a Member of Parliament are to be exercised. In the second, it is difficult to define beforehand what are the questions which affect the interests of the Church. A question which has no immediate apparent connection with the Church might have a practical bearing upon its welfare ten times more important than another question which might appear directly to concern it. Thirdly, by excluding the Roman Catholic from giving his individual vote, you do little to diminish his real influence, if you leave him the power of speaking, of biassing the judgments of others on the question on which he is not himself to vote; and if, by a jealous and distrusting but ineffectual precaution, you tempt him to exercise to your prejudice the remaining power of which you cannot, or do not propose to deprive him, I believe there is more of real security in confidence than in avowed mistrust and suspicion, unaccompanied by effectual guards. For these reasons I am unwilling to deprive the Roman Catholic Member of either House of Parliament of any privilege of free discussion, and free exercise of judgment, which belongs to other Members of the Legislature."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 758.]

Now, I say that Sir Robert Peel anticipated and answered the arguments now being put forward. Is it nothing that a large section of the Members of this House should be placed in a position of inferiority by being compelled to enter it upon conditions from which others are exempt? Does not that imply inferiority? Every other Member, no matter what his creed, may vote upon every subject which comes before the House. The Roman Catholic alone is debarred from the exercise of that right. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Whiteside) said the other day that Henry VIII. complained that he was only half a King; may not the noble Lord the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard), who represents a Protestant constituency, say that he is only half a Member of Parliament? The real objection is that which has been stated by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt). A Roman Catholic may put his own construction upon the oath, and a Protestant may put his own construction upon his conduct; and therefore an honourable, high-minded, and conscientious Roman Catholic, acting upon his conscience and taking his own view of the oath, may find the finger of scorn pointed at him from the other side of the House, and may next day see columns of the newspapers teeming with reproaches against him for having violated an oath which, in his conscience, he does not believe that he has violated. But there is another case which has escaped the notice of my hon. Friend (Mr. Hunt). Apply it to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell). The right hon. Gentleman takes an oath in this House that he will do nothing to weaken the Established Church, but he takes another oath as a Privy Councillor that he will upon every question openly, conscientiously, and solemnly give such advice as he believes to be for the public good. The question of the Irish Church comes on; he has to advise upon that question, and he thinks, let us suppose, that that Church ought to be abolished. He has taken an oath in this House binding him not to interfere with the Established Church in

Ireland, and he has taken another as a Privy Councillor which obliges him to advise its abolition. This is not the case merely of an unnecessary or doubtful oath, but of two absolutely conflicting oaths. I will not be tempted to go further into this question, but with reference to the reproach which has been levelled at my right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell) for bringing this Bill forward because he is a Roman Catholic, I must say that if the Government will not introduce a Bill, and if no Protestant Member will introduce a Bill, I think my right hon. Friend has only exercised a wise discretion in proposing a measure which will rescue himself from a great reproach, and confer a great boon upon all his co-religionists.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he wished to state that the late Sir Robert Peel, to his dying day, instead of in any way relaxing the opinion he expressed in 1849, had learnt by experience the value of the securities he had in that year recommended the House to retain, and which it was the object of this Bill to remove. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Horsman) had read history in a very strange manner. The right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to persuade the House to accept certain expressions, which fell from the late Sir Robert Peel in 1829, in opposition to the tenour of the Act which Sir Robert Peel then carried, and to his deliberate opinion expressed in 1849. The right hon. Gentleman wished the House to believe that the late Sir Robert Peel had gained nothing by experience in those twenty years. In 1854 the late Mr. Goulburn had assured him (Mr. Newdegate) that Sir Robert Peel, so far from undervaluing the securities which he willingly accepted and adopted in 1829, adhered to them as he did, being himself a Member of the Government which adopted these securities—not as a matter of compact if the right hon. Gentleman opposite objected to that word — but on the authority of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland. So far from departing from those securities, Sir Robert Peel, within one year of his death, and although favourable to the admission of Jews to that House, warned the House not to depart from the settlement of 1829, lest this country should be involved in those bitter controversies which it had been his object to calm and assuage. He (Mr. Newdegate) warned the Protestant Dissenters of this country of the mistake they were making on this question. Their predecessors had made a like mistake. But one year previous to the Revolution of 1688, in 1687, the Dissenters and Quakers had been so attracted by the declaration in favour of religious equality issued by James II., that they attended him bareheaded with expression of their gratitude, and yet the very next year they were compelled to concur in the deposition of the King, because they found that the power and tyranny of Rome had become almost supreme in this country, although there was not one Roman Catholic to a hundred Protestants at that time, yet Jesuitism insinuated itself into the affairs of State. This attempt at Supremacy, on the part of Rome, was defeated at the Revolution. Previous to the reign of Elizabeth no oath was taken by any Member equivalent to that now accepted by each Member at the table—no oath such as that established in 1829. Why should that oath be abrogated? The House was told that it was painful to Roman Catholics to have to repudiate the doctrines ascribed to them. But what was the language of the Encyclical letter of last December? That letter touched, not only on matters of religion, but of jurisdiction, for the Pope asserted it to be criminal for any Roman Catholic to hold that the temporal affairs of States and Nations were exempt from his authority.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 147; Noes 166: Majority 19.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Thursday.*

AYES.

Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Archdall, Captain M.
Astell, J. H.
Aytoun, R. S.
Barrow, W. H.
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, Sir M.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, D. W. Pack-
Bernard, hon. Colonel
Boyle, hon. G. F.
Bremridge, R.
Brooks, R.
Bromley, W. D.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruen, H.
Butler, C. S.
Caird, J.
Cargill, W. W.
Cave, S.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Conolly, T.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dick, F.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. A.
Du Pre, C. G.
Edwards, Colonel
Egerton, E. C.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Fellowes, E.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Floyer, J.
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Forster, Sir G.
Fraser, Sir W. A.

Getty, S. G.
Goddard, A. L.
Gore, J. R. O.
Gore, W. R. O.
Greenall, G.
Greenwood, J.
Grey de Wilton, Visct.
Grogan, Sir E.
Haliburton, T. C.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, Viscount
Hardy, G.
Hardy, J.
Hartopp, E. B.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Hill, hon. R. C.
Holford, R. S.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hotham, Lord
Howes, E.
Ingestre, Viscount
Jolliffe,rt.hn.SirW.G.H.
Jolliffe, H. H.
Kendall, N.
Kennard, R. W.
Ker, D. S.
King, J. K.
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, Colonel
Knox, hon. Major S.
Langton, W. G.
Langton, W. H. G.
Leeke, Sir H.
Lefroy, A.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leslie, C. P.
Long, R. P.
Lowther, hon. Col.
Lytton,rt. hn. Sir G. E.
L. Bulwer
Macaulay, K.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Manners, Lord G. J.
Miles, Sir W.
Miller, T. J.
Miller, W.
Mills, A.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Murray, W.
Naas, Lord
Newdegate, C. N.
Noel, hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
O'Neill, E.
Packe, C. W.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Papillon, P. O.
Parker, Major W.
Patten, Colonel W.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Pryse, E. L.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Salt, T.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Selwyn, C. J.
Shirley, E. P.
Smith, A. (Herts)
Smith, S. G.
Somes, J.
Stanhope, J. B.
Stronge, Sir J. M.
Stuart, Lieut. Col. W.
Sturt, H. G.
Sturt, Lieut. Col. N.
Surtees, H. E.
Taylor, Colonel
Tollemache, J.
Torrens, R.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Treherne, M.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Verner, Sir W.
Verner, E. W.
Walcott, Admiral
Waldegrave-Leslie,hnG
Walker, J. R.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Welby, W. E.
Whiteside, rt. hon. J.
Williams, F. M.
Woodd, B. T.

TELLERS.

Cairns, Sir H.
Whitmore, H.

NOES.

Acton, Sir J. D.
Adam, W. P.
Antrobus, E.
Ayrton, A. S.
Bagwell, J.
Baring, H. B.
Baring, rt. hn. Sir F. T.
Baring, T. G.
Bass, M. T.
Bazley, T.
Beale, S.
Beaumont, W. B.
Berkeley, hon. H. F.
Berkeley,hn.Col.F.W.F.
Blake, J. A.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, hon. P. P.
Brady, Dr.
Bramston, T. W.
Brand, hon. H.
Bright, J.
Browne, Lord J. T.
Bruce, Lord E.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Burke, Sir T. G.
Calthorpe, hon. F. H.
W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Cheetham, J.
Childers, H. C. E.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Cogan, W. H. F.
Coke, hon. Colonel
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colthurst, Sir G. C.
Corbally, M. E.
Cox, W.
Crawford, R. W.
Davey, R.
Denman, hon. G.
Dickson, Colonel
Dillwyn, L. L.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Dunne, M.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, J. C.
Fenwick, E. M.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, C.
Forster, W. E.
Foster, W. O.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
French, Colonel
Gavin, Major
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Glyn, G. C.
Glyn, G. G.
Goschen, G. J.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Greene, J.
Gregory, W. H.
Greville, Colonel F.
Grey, rt. hon. Sir G.
Grosvenor, Earl
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Hadfield, G.
Hassard, M.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henley, Lord
Hennessy, J. P.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hodgkinson, G.
Horsman, rt. hon. E.
Howard, Lord E.
Hunt, G. W.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Kennedy, T.
Kinglake, A. W.
Kingscote, Colonel
Layard, A. H.
Lawson, W.
Leader, N. P.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Lever, J. O.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
Longfield, R.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
MacEvoy, E.
Mackinnon, W. A.
Maguire J. F.
Majoribanks, D. C.
Martin, J.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moor, H.
Moore, C.
North, F.
O'Conor Don, The
O'Donoghue, The
O'Farrall, rt. hn. R. M.
Ogilvy, Sir J.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
O'Reilly, M. W.
Packe, Colonel
Padmore, R.
Paget, C.
Paget, Lord C.
Palmer, Sir R.
Palmerston, Viscount
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Peel, rt. hon. F.
Peel, J.
Pilkington, J.
Pinney, Colonel
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.
Pritchard, J.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Redmond, J. E.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Russell, F. W.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Scholefield, W.
Scully, V.
Seymour, W. D.
Seymour, A.
Shelley, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, H. B.
Smith, M. T.
Stacpoole, W.
Stanley, hon. W. O.
Stansfeld, J.
Stuart, Colonel C.
Taylor, P. A.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Turner, J. A.
Vandeleur, Colonel
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vyner, R. A.
Waldron, L.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Westhead, J. P. Brown-
Whitbread, S.
White, hon. L.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wrightson, W. B.

TELLERS.

Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Castlerosse, Viscount

RECORD OF TITLE (IRELAND) BILL.

(*Lords*)—[Bill 151.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Every Description of Title may be recorded, and need not be registered in the Deeds Registry. 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 72, s. 51).

Mr. WHITESIDE moved, in line 25, to leave out—

"And no delaration of title so entered upon the record shall be registered in the office for Registering Deeds in Ireland."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he admitted the force of the Amendment, and proposed to meet the right hon. Gentleman's views by the addition of certain words to Clause 16.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Any Person obtaining a Conveyance or Declaration may decline to have his Title recorded under this Act).

Mr. WHITESIDE moved, in line 35, to leave out "not." He said his object was to render the Bill completely permissive, as the promoters of it said they wished it to be.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must object to the Amendment, on the ground that the word proposed to be left out would not, in the slightest degree, affect its permissive character.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 8 and 9 *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Books of Record not to be inspected without Leave. 25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 53, ss. 15 and 137. Index to be made).

Mr. WHITESIDE moved, in line 26, to leave out from "inspected" to "judge," in line 29, and insert—

"In like manner as the registry of Deeds in Ireland may be inspected by the public under the Statutes Regulating the Registry of Deeds Office."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must oppose the Amendment as calculated to gratify the curiosity with regard to private property of persons not interested in it. It might even be used for fraudulent purposes.

Mr. HASSARD said, that for 150 years they had courted publicity in this matter in Ireland, instead of shunting it, and it had always been found beneficial.

Mr. SCULLY said, he would prefer an open registry, but did not wish to do anything that would endanger the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he would concede the addition of words, giving an enlarged power of inspection, intermediate between the clause and the Amendment—adopting, in fact, the clause for the English Registration Act.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Every charge, &c., to be entered in Record of Title. 25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 53, s. 32).

Mr. SCULLY said, he approved of the Bill so far as it provided for the registration of title, but objected to the enactment providing for the establishment of another Registry of Deeds.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, he very much preferred the system of registration of title to the system of the registration of deeds. He would support the clause, though it was not as perfect as it might have been.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 29 (Other Deeds may be recorded, on Evidence of due Execution. Originals or Copies to be retained in Court).

Mr. WHITESIDE moved, to leave out clause. He said the clause made of this Record of Title another Registry of Deeds Office. He objected to this double system of registration.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it was not intended to fetter the modes of transfer.

Clause, with Amendments, *agreed to.*

Clause 40 (Interests, &c. may be recorded by Reference. No Appeal to lie if the Judge declines to record separately).

Mr. SCULLY said, the Attorney General seemed to think that a charge under a settlement could be recorded without reference to the settlement. He submitted that everything within the settlement should be made known, thus giving notice to the parties who should purchase the charge under that settlement.

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. WHITESIDE moved the following clause:—

"That any perons who has obtained from the Commissioners for the Sale of Incumbered Estates in Ireland or from the Landed Estates Court a conveyance or declaration of title, or who shall hereafter obtain the same, may apply every five years by summary petition, supported by such evidence as the Court shall require, to be declared the owner, with registry of indefeasible title as originally granted by the Court; and upon the declaration of the Court, granted and registered or recorded as may be required by law, the person named therein shall be deemed owner as declared, to all intents and purposes."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must object to the clause.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, the clause was likely to introduce a new question as to costs.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again on *Thursday.*

POOR LAW BOARD CONTINUANCE, &c., BILL—[Bill 197.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that its objects were to provide for the continuance of the Poor Law Board for a limited period, and to introduce some Amendments of the general law regulating the relief of the poor. Had not the Session been so far advanced, and a dissolution so near at hand, he should have submitted to the House a measure of a more extended character; but as the time at their disposal was so short, and hon. Members seemed so disinclined for controversy, he had abstained from introducing matters which might have excited some difference of opinion. At one time there was a great disinclination to renew this Commission. Memorials had been presented a few years ago for limiting the power of the Board, and petitions to this House had complained of the manner in which the Board exercised its authority. This led the House to agree to a very full inquiry into the administration and operation of the law, and, after a very lengthened investigation, the Committee made their Report, having come to the conclusion that not only was it essential to the good working of the law that some system of central supervision should exist, but, rather in opposition to what had been recommended on the part of the Poor Law Board itself, the Committee decided that the time had come when the central authority should be rendered permanent, but not at the suggestion of the Poor Law Board, rather indeed in opposition to a proposal which he himself made to them—that the time had come when the Department which was to have the supervision of the administration of that law ought to be placed upon a permanent footing. Under the peculiar circumstances of the present Session, to which he had referred, and as the country had had but little as yet considered so important a change, he had not thought it right to adopt that recommendation of the Committee, and by this Bill he only proposed to renew the powers of the Board for—a shorter time than usual—for a period of three years, so that in the next or succeeding Session the question as to whether it should be placed upon a permanent footing might be fully considered and deliberately decided. For similar reasons, he had confined the Amendments of the law which he proposed to make under this Bill to those of giving more distinct and effective application to that, the policy of which had already been decided upon by the Legislature, and to give effect to which, indeed, the Poor Law Board had already issued its general orders. For instance, in the 19th section of the 4 & 5 *Will.* IV. there was the most distinct recognition of the principle of equal respect for different religious professions of the inmates of workhouses, and it was provided that they should have the attendance of ministers of their own persuasions, and should not be compelled to attend the services of a religion other than their own. The Legislature had been consistent on this matter for the last thirty years in all measures that involved the same question. The case of the industrial schools might be mentioned as strictly analogous to the case of the workhouses. In the Industrial School Act provision was made for the distinct entry of the religion of every child in a book for that purpose. In order to carry out the intention of the 19th section of the Poor Law Act, the Poor Law Board had from time to time issued general orders requiring that a book should be kept in which an entry should be made of the religious persuasion of every person who was admitted to the workhouse. These orders had been but very imperfectly obeyed, in some cases they had been entirely disregarded; and the result had been the occasion of much confusion and of much angry controversy between the authorities of the union and the clergy as to the religion of the inmates. The poor among the Roman Catholics stated that their children had been brought up as Protestants, and Protestants had given evidence that where Roman Catholic parents had changed their religion their children were still brought up as Roman Catholics. This arose from the want of a proper system of registration of the religion of the children. The Bill would give the Poor Law Board more power to enforce obedience to their orders in this respect than they at present possessed. The Committee recommended that in the case of workhouses in which there were more Roman Catholic than Protestant inmates, the Roman Catholic ministers who attended them should be paid out of the rates; but, as he desired to introduce nothing novel, or, as he said before, likely to provoke dispute, into the Bill, he had not adopted that recommendation. He had confined his Bill to carrying out the known intentions of the Legislature, as they had been already declared in different Acts. The Bill simply provided for the registration of the religion of the inmates of the workhouses, and the register being made accessible to the ministers of religion visiting the union. Another amendment of the law which he proposed to make was to provide for the better classification of the inmates of workhouses; this was a matter to which the Poor Law Board had always attached the greatest importance, but to which guardians, in consequence of the additional expense which it might occasion, had been indisposed to attend to. Hitherto the Poor Law Board had been powerless in the matter, because there was a limit to the expenditure which they could compel the guardians to incur for this purpose; but a clause in this Bill would give the Board the power to direct the guardians to effect the arrangements requisite to secure a better classification of the inmates. The last clause of any importance was that which enabled the Poor Law Board to dissolve the old incorporations, known familiarly by the name of Gilbert's Unions. Many of these had dissolved themselves voluntarily; others, through some defect in their constitution, gave the Central Board the power of bringing them within their jurisdiction, and only about twelve of them were now left, who administered the law much in the way it used to be done before the Poor Laws were reformed. The only thing preventing their dissolution hitherto had been that the consent of two-thirds of the guardians was requisite, which of course, in some cases, it was difficult to obtain, and a clause in this Bill would enable the Board to dispense with that consent in future. He did not mean to say that all the Gilbert's Unions were ill-managed, and any which were well conducted according to the modern system would not of necessity be dissolved under this Bill. The remainder of the Bill consisted only of details of less importance, and which might be postponed if any real objection existed on the point. They embodied, however, improvements which had been long demanded, and which he imagined would excite no opposition. The Bill contained nothing that was novel in principle, or to the best of his recollection that had not been unanimously supported by the Committee upstairs. He trusted, therefore, the House would be willing to read the Bill a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. C. P. Villiers.*)

MR. HENLEY said, he did not intend to oppose the Bill. The first clause was necessary, for it would not do to let the Poor Law Board drop all of a moment. But he noticed that the title of the measure being "The Poor Law Board Continuance, &c., Bill," one clause was devoted to the continuance of the Board, and twenty-six or twenty-seven clauses were contained in the *et cetera*. He would not weary the House by going through the *et cetera*, but the House and the country had a right to complain that this Bill embodying, in part, the recommendations of a Committee which had sat for three or four years, was not brought forward till after the Whitsuntide recess, when by the issue of the electioneering address of one Member of the Cabinet at least Parliament had been warned that its days were numbered. There was one of the clauses which the right hon. Gentleman had oddly left unnoticed, and this was Clause 19, in which he had taken power to prohibit the Bible in workhouses —at least to prohibit "any religious book" —and he presumed we had not yet attained to that pitch when the Bible or Prayer Book would cease to be accounted a religious book. The right hon. Gentleman, doubtless, would not abuse the power vested in him any more than anybody else, but this was certainly one of the "insignificant details," which deserved a little consideration. Every clause in the Bill did one of two things; either it increased the arbitrary powers of the Poor Law Board, or else it exempted the Board from doing some of those things which had been found necessary to enable the country to administer those arbitrary laws beneficially. Penalties for infringing the orders of the Board hitherto could not be enforced by magistrates at petty sessions till the orders under seal had been circulated to those petty sessions. By this Bill, however, the right hon. Gentleman made it no longer necessary to distribute these orders, but only to send them to the Clerk of the Peace for the county. In the name of common-sense, how were magistrates at petty sessions, in such a county as Yorkshire, to know anything about documents sent to the Clerk of the Peace. He knew from experience that the Poor Law Board were pretty active in laying informations against those who did not obey their rules and orders. Again, it might be very proper that parties should be put under a Poor Law auditor, but why should large villages and towns at present under the Watching and Lighting Acts have their position altered without notice to the parties? Neither they nor the House should be called on to deal post-haste with the provisions of this Bill. The proposal to charge upon the rates the superannuation of the registrars of births and marriages was a totally new matter, upon which they ought to have the opportunity of consulting local opinion. Regarding the persons who were to be subject to the vagrant laws, the provisions were exceedingly vague and arbitrary, and altogether the manner in which the Bill was brought forward was most unsatisfactory. To sweep away the Gilbert Unions without the opportunity of saying a word for themselves was a tolerably strong proposal. He had no knowledge of these unions; they might be either so perfect as to put the guardians of Poor Law Unions to shame, or so bad that they ought to be put down at once. Experience, however, of the working of some of the Poor Law Unions, even in London, had shown that the Poor Law authorities were far from perfect in their own management. As he had stated, he would not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but he reserved to himself the right to take whatever course he thought fit in Committee. If this Bill were really what it professed to be, a continuance Bill, the best course would be to confine its scope to the simple object of continuing the Board for another year, striking out all the other clauses, and leaving to a future Session the consideration of the question whether the Poor Law Board should or should not be rendered a permanent body. There were a great number of questions to be discussed, and therefore it would be a great advantage if the Bill were to be made merely a continuance Bill, and the proposed measure postponed until next Session.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, the right hon. Gentleman had made two bold assertions—namely, that there was nothing in the Bill open to controversy, and that he had the authority of the Committee which sat on the subject for everything proposed in it. Now, he had been a Member of the Committee appointed in 1861 to take the subject of Poor Law Amendment into consideration, and he was desirous of vindicating the conduct of that Committee before the House from the supposition that they were answerable for all the clauses contained in the Bill, many of those clauses being, in fact, the sole invention of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Poor Law Board. One of these clauses not only gave the right hon. Gentleman power to forbid the circulation of any religious book in the workhouses, but made any pauper reading any book not authorized by him liable to punishment. He wished to know in whom lay the control, who was the chief censor of this *index expurgatorius*, and whether the sacred conclave was to be assembled in Whitehall Place. The clause which applied the Vagrant Act to persons relieved out of the workhouse who refused to perform the work required of them was another invention of the right hon. Gentleman, for which the Committee were in no way responsible. The only point upon which the Committee had been thoroughly unanimous was that an end should be put to this system of half and half legislation, that the House of Commons should make up its mind no longer to continue the system of prolonging the existence of the Poor Law Board for three or five years at a time, but should decide once for all whether the Board should be done away with altogether or should be made a permanent institution. The proper course open to the right hon. Gentleman was to have brought in a simple continuance Bill this Session, so that when Parliament next met the question might have been fully discussed, and the recommendation of the Committee that the institution should be made a permanent one have been adopted or rejected. Both the Committee and the House had good reason to complain of the time which had been chosen by the right hon. Gentleman for bringing in the Bill. The Committee sent in its Report in May of last year. The right hon. Gentleman delayed the bringing in of the Houseless Poor Act—one of its recommendations—until the last fortnight of the Session, so that it was impossible that the provisions of the Bill could be properly discussed, and he now asked them to pass the present Bill under almost similar circumstances. He concurred with the right hon. Gentleman as to the general principle of the Bill, but he could not approve his bringing the matter before the House, founded as it was upon an incorrect—he said it without meaning any offence—statement. The principle of the creed register was most warmly contested; and, although the Roman Catholics carried their point, the masters of all the London workhouses opposed them most strongly, and he complained that the right hon. Gentleman had not fairly represented the feeling of the Committee upon the subject. One of the difficulties they had to contend with was the education of pauper Roman Catholic children with Protestant children, and the Committee adopted a conciliatory clause, under which Roman Catholic children could have been educated in the school with the consent of their parents; but the right hon. Gentleman had omitted any conciliatory provision of the kind from his Bill. As there were so many questions of importance to be discussed, and as at that period of the Session it would be ridiculous to try to amend the Bill, he called upon the right hon. Gentleman to turn his Bill into a simple continuance Bill, so that the matter might be fully gone into in the course of next Session.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he thought that the objections taken by the noble Lord were perfectly just. The Bill had only been placed in the hands of Members on Friday. There were a number of unions who were opposed to many of its clauses. The Government would gain nothing by pressing the measure. The guardians and not the Poor Law Board would have to carry it out, and time till next Session ought to be given to allow of its provisions being considered by the country.

Sir JOHN TROLLOPE said, he thought that the reason urged by the hon. Member for Perth ought to have weight with the Poor Law Board. Many of the Boards of Guardians met only once a fortnight, and could not therefore be acquainted with the nature of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman by his proposition to take power to coalesce a number of parishes, giving them only one guardian, was interfering directly with the principle of the Poor Law, which was, that representation should be according to taxation. Many parishes with the smallest population had a large amount of rateable property, but power was taken by the Bill to suppress by the veto of the Poor Law Board the representation of those small parishes, except as annexed to a larger and more populous parish. This was a power which the country would hardly be prepared at so short a notice to sanction. He thought time ought to be given, and that the Bill should be a simple continuance Bill. If the obnoxious clauses were not withdrawn, it would be his duty to propose that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. NEATE said, he cordially concurred in the suggestion that the right hon. Gentleman should make the Bill simply a continuance Bill. There was one matter which ought particularly to be kept in mind, and that regarded the medical profession. The medical profession ought to have an opportunity to bring the grievances which, rightly or wrongly, they held themselves to suffer before the House, and which, if the present opportunity was refused them, could not be afforded them. The condition of the vagrant or casual poor also was one which required revision. It was most desirable that the Poor Law Board should have powers to enforce uniformity of treatment; and that the poor should not have to go from one place to another in order to obtain better treatment. It was understood in the late debates that a Committee would be appointed next year who would take into consideration the power which the Central Board possessed of deciding as to the limits of unions. The result of the inquiries of such a Committee might be a modification of that power of the Central Board. He did not say a word against the principle of making the Poor Law Board a permanent one, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to be content with the triumphant majority by which his Union Chargeability Bill had been carried in another place, and take this continuance Bill for one year only, in order to give the next Parliament an opportunity of considering the many important questions that had been raised.

Mr. KNIGHT said, that in one respect the Bill flew in the face of repeated decisions of the House. There was a clause in the Bill which would materially interfere with a very useful Act, the General Lighting and Watching Act, under which small towns and large villages had been enabled to form little municipalities for the purpose of effecting certain improvements. There were 300 or 400 of these little municipalities, all of which would be astonished to find themselves deprived of the powers which they possessed under that Act if this Bill passed. Nothing was so offensive to the Poor Law Board as the existence of such little municipalities, and it was their earnest wish to get them under their thumb. It was a perfectly wanton thing to introduce a clause which would so seriously affect the rights of those little municipalities. The House had repeatedly decided that this Board should look after the poor and nothing else; and if they became a permanent Board he feared—from this perfectly wanton attempt in a continuance Bill to get hold of these 400 little places—that there would be great difficulty to keep it in the right path.

MR. PACKE said, unless the right hon. Gentleman would be content to pass simply the first clause, and to leave the other clauses to be dealt with by the new Parliament—clauses which it had been truly said the guardians had had no opportunity of considering—he would move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD said, his right hon. Friend (Mr. C. P. Villiers) was rather hardly dealt with. Some blamed him for doing too much, and others for doing too little. He himself was inclined to blame him for doing too little. Having had some experience of the working of the Poor Law Board during the severe distress in the manufacturing districts, he could wish the Board to be permanent. But his right hon. Friend did not take steps to make it permanent. That showed his right hon. Friend's modesty. He (Lord Edward Howard) was one of the original sinners in this matter. In 1860 he took the liberty to make a Motion, which, to a certain extent, was the cause of the appointment of the Committee. That Committee sat in 1861, in 1862, and every year down to last year, with the exception of one, and his right hon. Friend was not forgetful of the recommendations of the Committee. This was another instalment of them, and after the long consideration of the matter upstairs he hoped it would be adopted. Instead of blaming his right hon. Friend they should rather urge him on. He was thankful to his right hon. Friend, for half a loaf was better than no bread, and he did not think that any argument had been adduced to-night which should prevent his right hon. Friend from going on with the Bill. How did hon. Members know that they were so near the end of the Session? There were some forty or fifty orders on the paper to-night, and all those orders could not be got rid of in a hurry.

MR. BROMLEY said, he had been glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. C. P. Villiers) state that the measure provided for the better classification of the poor within the workhouses, but having carefully looked through the Bill he had been unable to find anything in it which would tend to that effect.

MR. ARTHUR MILLS said, that the Bill, though containing valuable elements, omitted two-thirds of the recommendations of the Committee which sat for three years; and he thought that more time ought to be given, in order to do justice to the subject. He hoped proper Medical Inspectors would be appointed to workhouses.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he thought that the President of the Poor Law Board was scarcely justified in asserting that this measure contained very little more than the powers of the existing Act. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. C. P. Villiers) asked the House to enact into law very stringent regulations, and he did not make any provision for supplying petty sessions with copies of the Bill, if it became law. He proposed to increase the direct power of the Poor Law Board over the Guardians, and the House was asked to do this without notice of their intentions to the Guardians, who would naturally view such a course with extreme jealousy, which would not be diminished by the introduction of the clauses for teaching children. This clause was introduced at the instance of the noble Lord (Lord Edward Howard), the only Member who had spoken in favour of the Bill, and who, he supposed, must be taken as an exponent of a certain class of Roman Catholic opinion. Recently the noble Lord wrote two letters to certain parties in Liverpool—letters which were published in the Roman Catholic newspapers; and in them he stated that he was urging upon the Legislature to intrust the education of the Roman Catholic children to the Roman Catholic priesthood. In these letters the noble Lord very candidly told the Roman Catholic priesthood that the state of morality among Roman Catholics of Liverpool particularly, and other large towns, was not such as would commend the effect of their exertions to the Legislature, and yet he now advocated this Bill for committing the education of Roman Catholic children to them. This Bill contained another blow at the parochial system—of which, though the Poor Law Board was jealous, the House was not—power was sought to suppress the representation of any parish of small population in the Board of Guardians. Step by step the Poor Law Board was inducing the Legislature to strike down the parochial system which had proved so beneficial to the country. He thought that Members ought to be allowed the opportunity of consulting their constituents as to whether that entirely uniform system which the right hon. Gentleman was so bent upon carrying out was acceptable to the country. There had been strong objections to what was termed ticketting Dissenters, and yet the proposal was to ticket Dissenters in workhouses. This required more consideration than the right hon. Gentleman seemed willing to permit, in his haste to pass this Bill. He joined in the all but unanimous appeal which had been made to the Government to content themselves with a simple continuance Bill, and not to thrust upon the country, without due notice, provisions which would create difference of opinion and the greatest dislike among all classes.

Mr. HIBBERT said, he must blame the Government for introducing this Bill at so late a period of the Session. The House and the country had not had proper opportunity for considering the changes in the law proposed. He was disappointed not only at what the Bill contained, but at what it did not contain. He regretted to see the Poor Law Board disposed more and more to grasp the powers that ought to be left to Boards of Guardians, and he was disappointed to find that the Poor Law Board had not thought that a greater liberty might be given to the Guardians. After thirty years' experience Boards of Guardians might be presumed to know their business. They ought to have some real power over their servants, but they could not appoint the lowest of their officers without a reference to London. They could not appoint a cook, a nurse, or a porter; they could not fix or alter their salaries, or dismiss them, without referring the matter to London. The right hon. Gentleman might have relaxed some of the more stringent portions of the central administration, for it did not become either the dignity of the Poor Law Board, or that of the Boards of Guardians, to hold the reins so tightly over the latter. The House ought to have a fuller opportunity of considering these changes in the law.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that at this moment there were thousands of Catholic children in workhouses in England taught by Protestant teachers and clergymen. The Roman Catholics regarded that as a great grievance. The Select Committee recommended that little children in workhouses, up to the age of twelve years, should be removed to schools where they could be taught by teachers and clergymen of their own denomination. The Committee also recommended that in workhouses in which there were many Roman Catholics, a Roman Catholic chaplain should be appointed, but there was no such provision in the Bill.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY said, he thought it would be better for the interests of the poor, the Poor Law Board, and the public, that the Government should merely propose a continuance Bill for one year, and leave the larger question to be dealt with by the new Parliament. The medical treatment of the poor was a subject which called for inquiry, but no mention was made of it in the present Bill.

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he must decline to follow hon. Members through the several clauses of the Bill It must be apparent to the Government that the Bill was too wide to be dealt with at this late period of the Session. There were many provisions with regard to lighting and watching, and the union of parishes which, he thought, would come as a surprise upon the country. It was based on the Report of the Select Committee, and yet not a clause of it came up to the recommendation of the Committee. The Committee disapproved of the construction of the Poor Law Board; but there was no remedy in the Bill. Though there were parts of the Bill with which he concurred, he could not concur with other parts. He thought that children of the Roman Catholic religion should be educated by those in whom they had confidence. He would recommend all the clauses except the first to be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER then put the Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. PACKE said, he had moved, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he had not understood the hon. Member to go the length of moving the Amendment; but if the hon. Member stated that he had done so he should accept his statement.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Packe.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, he thought that the only way of dealing with the objections urged against the Bill was to read it a second time, and allow them to be considered in Committee. He hoped hon. Members would make some allowance for him if he confessed that he was puzzled to understand what was really meant by the opposition that had been offered to the Bill. It was argued on the one hand that the Bill did not follow the recommendations of the Committee, and it was contended on the other hand that it went too far in following those recommendations. As he understood him, the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) said that the recommendation of the Committee in respect of the children of Roman Catholic parents was not adopted in the Bill; neither did the Bill give full effect to the recommendations generally as to Roman Catholics in the workhouses. Now, what ground had the noble Lord to complain of this, when his noble Friend the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard) expressed himself satisfied with the good intentions, as he said, of the President of the Poor Law Board, and was satisfied that I had proposed all that could be carried, and gave his support to the Bill? The noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) was the Member of the Committee who had proposed to have paid priests for the workhouses; and it was true he (Mr. Villiers) had not adopted that recommendation because he felt sure that it would create great difference of opinion, as very different views on this subject were held by guardians throughout the country, and it would be inconvenient to have those discussed at the present time; but, as he thought there would be little difference of opinion with regard to the registration of the different religions of the inmates, he had embodied that recommendation in the Bill. The noble Lord told the House there was a recommendation of the Committee, that when the parents of Roman Catholic children in a workhouse wished those children to be placed in Catholic schools it should be obligatory on the guardians to comply with that wish. The Committee never had recommended anything of the sort. They had recommended something much short of that; that orphan children might be sent to these schools, after application made to the Central Board; but, as he thought there would be a difference of opinion on the point, he had not adopted their recommendation. What they had recommended was, that the Poor Law Board might receive an application to them from the friends of the children, and on their being satisfied that there was reasonable ground for conceding it, that all orphans under twelve years of age not belonging to the Established Church, might be ordered to be sent to schools of their own denomination, which had been certified or licensed by the Poor Law Board, and where the managers were willing to receive them. But what had that to do with the question that it should be made obligatory on the guardians to send Catholic children to schools where it was the wish of their parents they should be so placed? He had been astonished, also, to hear his hon. Friend the Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate) assert that the Committee, having given their attention to the medical question, it should have been dealt with in this Bill. The fact was the Committee did consider that subject deliberately, and reported that there were no sufficient grounds for materially interfering with the present system of medical relief.

Mr. NEATE said, he wished to explain. He had not said that the Committee had come to any opinion on the subject. What he had said was that the subject was one which had been very much considered by the Committee, and that it ought to be considered by the House.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, the hon. Gentleman complained of this omission in the Bill, and I repeat that the Committee reported that there was no sufficient ground for changing the present system of medical relief. This, then, furnished no ground for postponing the Bill. Two clauses had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley), and if the House thought they were objectionable, he was perfectly willing to withdraw them, seeing that they did not result from the inquiry before the Committee. One was the repeal of the clause in the Act requiring copies of the Poor Law Board's orders to be sent to clerks of petty sessions, and providing that certain orders should be sent to the clerk of the peace. The reason this clause was inserted was because it was an expense, and that the clerks of the petty sessions generally concurred in saying that there was no kind of use in sending those orders there; and, with regard to the other clause, providing that the accounts under the 3 & 4 *Will.* IV., the General Lighting and

Watching Act, should be rendered subject to audit, frequent representations had been made to the Board urging the insertion of such a provision. There was no immediate necessity, however, for the clause, nor did he attach much importance himself to Clause 11, which was inserted only because it was supposed to be a matter of great convenience to small townships that they should in future unite with others for the purpose of choosing a guardian, and had no other purpose whatever in view. The two clauses which seemed particularly offensive to hon. Gentlemen opposite, were, first, the one by which the Board would be able to acquire power at once to establish a better classification in workhouses, which in certain respects were extremely defective, and that which enabled them to dissolve some of the Gilbert Unions. Now there had been much complaint as to the classification now existing in workhouses, which confounded the good and bad together; and, as to the dissolution of the Gilbert Unions, though that is to be opposed now on the ground of private interest, it was especially from the opposite side of the House that complaints to him of their inconvenience had proceeded. The Poor Law Board did not desire to extend their power, they repudiated the idea altogether, but it was the deliberate opinion of the Committee that more power ought to be given to them for certain purposes. The Board were encumbered with power already—but further power and control had been forced upon them. He hoped the House would go into Committee, and then any clauses which might be deemed really objectionable to discuss at this time might be withdrawn.

Viscount GALWAY said, he thought the Gilbert Unions ought not to be dissolved without proper warning to those bodies.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, that constant notice had been given in answers to questions this Session, that the subject would be dealt with in this Bill. With regard to better classification it had not only reference to classify the vagrants and casual paupers in the workhouse, but to empower the Poor Law Board to order any Board of Guardians to provide for a somewhat better classification of the inmates of all kinds.

Mr. HENLEY said, the clause enabled the Poor Law Board to put its hands into the pockets of the ratepayers, for the erection of additional buildings, to any extent it thought proper. There were some absurd provisions. Under this Bill a child twelve years old was to be at liberty to choose his religion with the consent of the Poor Law Board. Thus a child in Yorkshire might become a Mahomedan or a Mormonite under the sanction of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, that what the right hon. Gentleman was referring to was provided for by his predecessor in the last Government, and was the law at present.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, that if, as the hon. Gentleman intimated, all the clauses of the Bill were to be withdrawn one after another in Committee, it would be better to withdraw the Bill at once and bring in a simple continuance Bill.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 76; Noes 69: Majority 7.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

CONSTABULARY FORCE (IRELAND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 178.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, that the Bill proposed to abolish the local police in the town of Belfast, and he now proposed, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission of Inquiry, to move the following clause:—

(Restrictions as to Age)

"Notwithstanding any regulations requiring persons entering the Constabulary Force to be unmarried or to be under a certain age, the Inspector General of the Constabulary Force in Ireland shall admit into the said Force any constable of the said local Police Force whose age shall not exceed forty years, and who within one calendar month after such notification in the "Dublin Gazette" as aforesaid, shall apply to be admitted, and who in other respects shall be eligible according to the said regulations."

Clause *brought up,* and read 1°.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he must oppose the clause. Under it men would be taken into the constabulary who were not practised in its rules, and the Inspector General was decidedly of opinion that these local police should not be admitted into the Irish constabulary force. If any of them complied with the regulations of the force, they would of course be accepted, but he held it was undesirable they should be admitted as a body. It would also cast an additional expense on the country.

Lord NAAS said, he should support the clause. It was hard that the town of Belfast should be charged with the superannuation of any of these men who were eligible for the general constabulary force.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 63; Noes 61: Majority 2.

Clause read 2°, and *added.*

Another Clause (Inspector General of Constabulary,)—(*Sir Robert Peel.*)

Clause *brought up,* read 1°; 2°; and *committed; considered* in Committee, *reported,* with an Amendment, and *added.*

Lord NAAS moved to insert schedule —

[Same as Schedule in Bill before amended.]

Clause 3, leave out after, "whereas it is expedient to alter the distribution of the Constabulary Force," to "Provided," and insert "in the several counties and towns in Ireland, and to allot to the town of Belfast a just proportion thereof; Be it therefore Enacted, That the Schedule to this Act annexed, and the distribution of Constabulary Force therein provided, shall be substituted for the Schedule annexed to the Act of the twentieth and twenty-first years of Her Majesty, chapter seventeen."

Brought up, and read 1°.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Schedule be now read a second time."

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he would remind the House that in 1867 the Lord Lieutenant would have power to re-allot the amount of constabulary for each county, and until that time he could assure the House that no change would be made in the charge upon the respective counties.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, that although a personal promise on the part of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) was a sufficient guarantee for his own intentions, it was not a security for the future action of any Lord Lieutenant who might exercise power before 1867.

Mr. BLAKE said, he hoped the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) would adhere to the schedule in the Bill.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON said, he thought there should be some more specific arrangement provided for in the Bill.

In answer to The O'Conor Don,

Lord NAAS said, that in re-inserting the schedule he proposed adopting the numbers inserted by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel).

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he would, in that case, consent to the Motion of the noble Lord.

Lord NAAS said, he would then withdraw his Motion, for the purpose of allowing the right hon. Baronet to propose the amended schedule.

Motion and Schedule, by leave, *withdrawn.*

New Schedule *added.*

An Amendment made.

Clause 4 (Increase and Reduction of Numbers of Constabulary by Lord Lieutenant).

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 38, to leave out the words "three hundred and twenty," in order to insert the words "two hundred and seventy," —(*Lord Naas,*)—instead thereof.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he must oppose the Amendment. The latter number had been adopted after considerable discussion in Committee. He could not yield on this point.

Sir HUGH CAIRNS said, he supported the Amendment on the ground that the lesser number was recommended by all the witnesses who were examined on the Commission.

Question put, "That the words 'three hundred and twenty' stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 49; Noes 47: Majority 2.

Another Amendment made.

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.

Resolutions [June 8] *reported.*

Mr. LAYARD said, that when the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) asked a question the other evening with regard to an item charged for the travelling expenses of Lord Amberley he was unable at the time to afford the explanation. He desired, however, now to state that Lord Amberley was acting as private secretary and attaché to Mr. Elliot, and that his Lordship was so named in the documents which were, in conformity with the usual custom, forwarded to the Foreign Office. Those documents should be produced if the hon. Member desired to see them.

Mr. HENNESSY said, he thought that their production would be very desirable.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT CONTINUANCE.—LEAVE.

Sir ROBERT PEEL moved for leave to bring in a Bill to continue and amend the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue and amend 'The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856.'"—(*Sir Robert Peel.*)

Mr. HENNESSY said, he opposed the introduction of the Bill, which was a coercive measure, and wholly unnecessary. He begged, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

COMPTROLLER OF THE EXCHEQUER AND PUBLIC AUDIT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Bill to consolidate the offices of Comptroller of the Exchequer and Chairman of the Commissioners for Auditing the Public Accounts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 208.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 13, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Railway Passengers * (149); Defence Act (1860) Amendment * (152); Procurators (Scotland) * (153); Pilotage Order Confirmation * (No. 2) (154); Prisons * (155).

Second Reading—Partnership Amendment * (123); Land Debentures (Ireland) * (113); Militia Ballots Suspension *; Militia Pay.*

Select Committee—On Locomotives on Roads * (108), Lord Harris, Earl De Grey, Earl Ducie, Viscount Strathallan, Lord Calthorpe, and Lord Wenlock, *added;* and Duke of Sutherland and Lord Stanley of Alderley *discharged.*

Committee—Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment * (151); Mortgage Debentures * (107); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) * (127).

Report—Mortgage Debentures * (107); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) * (127).

Third Reading—Sewage Utilization * (134).

RAILWAY PASSENGERS BILL—(No. 149.)

PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of DARTMOUTH said, he wished to draw the attention of their Lordships to certain facts connected with the late lamentable railway accidents, which had been elicited from the witnesses examined at the coroner's inquest held on the bodies of those who were killed in the great accident on the Chester and Shrewsbury branch of the Great Western Railway. It appeared from the report of the inquest which appeared in *The Times* a few days ago that the engine-driver said the only danger signal he saw near the unsafe portion of the line was a small old green flag. That description of signal was not to be compared to the detonating signal in use upon most lines when any extra precaution on the part of the engine-driver was required. He believed that if that plan had been adopted, and proper arrangements made, these disasters would have been avoided. He also wished to point out that the railway companies were adopting the new and most dangerous system of placing passenger carriages instead of luggage vans next to the engines, and also at the end of the train. He did not mean to say that the precautions he had pointed out would altogether prevent such accidents as had already occurred, but the railway companies were bound to adopt every safeguard in their power.

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, he quite concurred in the necessity of every proper precaution against such lamentable disasters as those referred to. But he desired to draw attention to the objectionable practice adopted by some companies of locking both doors of the carriages, so that in case of the carriages taking fire, as in the accident near St. Germans, the passengers must inevitably be burnt to death. He had no objection to one door of the carriage being locked, as that might conduce to the safety of the passengers, who otherwise might get out on the wrong side and be killed by a passing train. He would lay on the table a Bill relating to this subject.

The Earl of CARDIGAN thought that some means ought to be taken to ensure ready communication between the passengers and the engine-drivers. A few years ago a number of persons were burnt, under the most horrible circumstances, in travelling between Paris and Versailles. If this communication had existed the accident might have been prevented.

Lord KINNAIRD said, he supposed, with Sidney Smith, that until a Bishop was burnt no sufficient precaution would be taken to prevent such accidents. He believed that on the Scotch railways only one door was locked.

THE EARL OF **CARDIGAN** feared that it was too much the practice to lock both doors.

THE MARQUESS OF **CLANRICARDE** thought the House had a right to know what the intentions of Government were upon this subject. Government certainly ought to bring in a Bill for the better regulation of the railways.

A Bill for the better Security of Railway Passengers—Was *presented* by The LORD SAINT LEONARDS; read 1ª; to be *printed.* (No. 149.)

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

EARL **GRANVILLE**: I feel quite sure that the Motion I am about to make will meet with the hearty concurrence of your Lordships. It is—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to congratulate Her Majesty on The Princess of Wales having happily given birth to another Prince, and to assure Her Majesty of the deep Interest felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the domestic Happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family."

THE EARL OF **MALMESBURY**: My Lords, in the absence of my noble Friend, the Earl of Derby, I beg to express the feelings of this side of the House, and to say how entirely we concur in the Motion which has been proposed by the noble Earl.

Motion *agreed to, Nemine Dissentiente,* and the said Address Ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA.—OBSERVATIONS.

LORD **CHELMSFORD** said, that when this subject was under discussion a few evenings ago, the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs stated that from a memorandum received at the Foreign Office it appeared to be Sir William Coghlan's opinion that it would be inexpedient to send a mission to the King of Abyssinia until the prisoners were liberated. At the time he thought that a most extraordinary opinion, inasmuch as the object of the proposed mission was the liberation of the prisoners. He now begged to read a letter, dated June 3, which a gallant Friend of his had received from Sir William Coghlan, from which it would appear that the noble Earl had taken an erroneous view of Sir William's memorandum:—

> "I kept no copy of the memorandum which I sent to the Foreign Office, and therefore I cannot say precisely how far I may have exposed myself to be misunderstood. What I intended to say was, that a mission of some dignity should be sent with an answer to the King's letter, and, as there would be an awkwardness in Her Majesty recognizing the fact of the captivity of her subjects, it would be expedient to make no mention of it in the answer, but to leave the Envoy to find it out, and, by the exercise of the large discretion to be accorded to him, to effect their release before he proceeded to the complimentary part of his mission, as he could not make presents and pay compliments while the captives were kept. That is what I meant, and I believe that to have been the right view at that time. But since the subject has been largely and publicly discussed, my suggestion that it should be left to the Envoy to discover the captivity of our people is no longer compatible. The Queen's letter must now recognize the fact, and the Envoy should be empowered to obtain their release by any means which may appear to him most suitable. It is impossible to prescribe for him a strict line of proceeding; the man sent on a mission of such difficulty and danger must be trusted. That is my present view of the case, and I am ready to act on it whenever called on."

The postscript followed, which it was evident the writer had not intended to be read to their Lordships; but he would take the liberty of reading it:—

> "P.S.—On looking over what I have written, it seems to me somewhat too free for publication in the House of Lords; but if Lord Chelmsford wishes to make use of it there, I dare say he will be able to extract enough for his purpose. Mr. Rassam's efforts appear to have failed, and there is now nothing for it but to make one from England. There is no disguising the fact that long delay has added to the difficulty, but that difficulty must be encountered and overcome."

He had felt it right to show how the matter really stood, and he thought the noble Earl would be ready to admit that there had been a mistake.

EARL **RUSSELL**: Certainly I did understand Sir William Coghlan's memorandum to be to the effect which I stated on a former occasion; but it appears, from the letter just read by the noble and learned Lord, that I was mistaken. The noble and learned Lord says he thought that it would have been a very extraordinary thing for Sir William Coghlan to be of opinion that a mission should not be sent to Abyssinia before the prisoners were liberated; but I must say that it would appear to me to be a very extraordinary proceeding to send out an English mission to go humbly before the King and ask him to receive presents while our Consul and other Europeans are still in custody under the circumstances which have been already detailed to your Lordships. The subject is attended with considerable difficulty; but I shall be ready to adopt any means that may appear feasible for the liberation of the captives.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I wish to ask the noble Earl whether the report is true which I have heard on what I believe to be good authority—namely, that the unfortunate mistake through which the letter of the King was detained for some months did not arise in the Foreign Office, but in the India Office. If this is the fact I think the public ought to know it; for, as respects the dignity of this country, this imprisonment of the Consul is one of the most important events which I remember to have occurred in our diplomatic history. It is true that a Consul does not stand in the rank of an Ambassador, but he occupies an official position to which he is appointed by the Crown, and his person is always considered as sacred as that of an Ambassador. I do not say that the noble Earl has been remiss in this matter; but I do not think he has been as prompt in vindicating the rights of a British subject as the case demands. I would remind your Lordships of some occurrences which have taken place of late years. In 1852, when an ill-mannered boy interfered with the band of an Austrian regiment at Florence and received a wound, the sum of £250 which I demanded in compensation for that offence was, by many persons in this country, thought to be an insufficient sum. In 1858, when the French Consul at Jedda was murdered and an attempt was made to assassinate the English Consul, what was done by the Government of Lord Derby? The compensation which was demanded not having been paid, an English ship bombarded the town, and we insisted on and obtained the execution of the murderers. I do not know whether the noble Earl is of opinion that his arm is not long enough to reach Abyssinia. But if so it comes to this—that the Queen cannot be advised to send her servants to places too far away to be reached by the arm of England, because if Ambassadors or Consuls are sent to such places, disgrace may fall upon this country, to say nothing of the cruelties which may be perpetrated upon individuals. I hope the noble Earl will take some action, and will do what he can to show that English servants are as safe under the protection of England now as ever they have been.

EARL RUSSELL: As to inducing the King of Abyssinia by force to give up these captives, the noble Earl knows that the whole country is now disturbed by civil war; that there are three or four different pretenders in possession of different points, all endeavouring to force the King into a corner. Instead of sending one ship we should have to send three or four, with some three or four thousand men, who would have to march through a hot climate before they could reach the King. On the other hand, I believe it is the opinion of those best able to judge, that if we were to send any mission to the King of Abyssinia he would probably imprison the persons composing it, with a view to forcing us to take his part against his rivals.

PUBLIC-HOUSES CLOSING ACT (1864) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 126).

COMMITTEE.

Moved, That the House be now put into Committee on the said Bill.—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

LORD KINNAIRD said, that though he did not intend to oppose the progress of the Bill, he believed it was calculated to do great injustice to the proprietors of those public-houses which should continue to be closed during the night. He should also say that he did not think it would be wise to alter an Act which had only been passed last year, and the effect of which could not yet have been adequately ascertained. In Scotland the public-houses were closed at eleven o'clock, and the Act enforcing that arrangement had operated most beneficially.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, that whatever might be the case in Scotland, it had been found that in this country, and more particularly in the metropolis, the people frequenting our markets, and other persons employed during the night-time, were subjected to great hardship and inconvenience by the Act of last year. The Bill was intended to remedy that evil, and he hoped that their Lordships would not refuse to give to it their sanction.

EARL GRANVILLE thought the original Act had worked very well, and was, therefore, anxious to see it amended in the point where it inflicted a hardship on certain classes. He hoped, however, that the noble Marquess (the Marquess of

Clanricarde) would consent to the omission of the 5th clause, which gave the power of granting those exceptional licences to magistrates at petty sessions. He trusted that the noble Marquess would consent to the Amendment which he intended to propose.

LORD REDESDALE said, he was not disposed to look with much favour on the measure. The case of compositors might, he thought, be easily met by their employers, who could make the necessary arrangements for their being supplied with refreshments during the night time. He should further say that he believed substantial refreshments were not desirable for people who remained up until three or four o'clock in the morning. With regard to market people, he should observe that he did not see how any houses could be left open for their use without extending the power to all the other establishments in the neighbourhood. He agreed with the noble Lord opposite (Lord Kinnaird) that one year did not afford sufficient time for testing the existing Act, and he believed that its continuance for another year would lead to the removal of many of the inconveniences to which it had given rise. Under all the circumstances of the case he was very much disposed to move that the Bill be committed on that day six months.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, he did not agree with the argument of the noble Lord, who wished to inflict upon certain classes restrictions which he would not think of imposing upon their Lordships. After a long debate and a late division their Lordships would think it hard if they were not permitted to have a glass of sherry and a chop. As to the advantages of going to bed upon light refreshments only, he had no faith in such arguments. The Bill was originally passed to close certain houses in the Haymarket, and was not intended in any way to put down drunkenness. The Bill would remove a great hardship to which a large class of persons was at present exposed, and he saw no reason whatever why it should not pass into law. It appeared that an Amendment was to be moved for the omission of the 5th clause, but as no sufficient notice had been given of the Amendment he hoped it would not then be pressed; and they could more conveniently discuss it in some future stage of the Bill. He objected to the manner in which the noble Earl the President of the Council proposed to move the omission of the 5th clause without notice, and thought it would be only right to allow the Bill to pass through Committee now, and to propose the Amendment upon the Report, by which time those interested would become acquainted with the nature of the Amendments.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON understood that his noble Friend the President of the Council had stated to the noble Marquess some time ago the nature of the Amendments he intended to propose. As, however, his noble Friend would not wish it to be supposed that he intended to take the House by surprise, he could not object to allow the Bill to pass through Committee, and to give notice of Amendments for the third reading.

LORD REDESDALE said, he thought it was a very inconvenient course to propose Amendments on the third reading of a Bill.

EARL GREY said, he entirely agreed in that opinion. They were in such cases unable to see the Bill printed with the Amendments, and they were thus exposed to the risk of falling into serious mistakes.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, he thought they were perfectly qualified to consider the proposed Amendment.

LORD REDESDALE said, he would not press his objection to the Bill; but he would suggest that its operation should be limited to a period of two years.

Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 14 *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Justices of the Peace to grant Licences).

EARL GRANVILLE moved that the clause be omitted from the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE refused to assent to the Amendment. If it were struck out now, he should move to re-insert it on the Report.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, that the police had refused to exercise the power of granting the licences which the Act of last year gave them in temporary cases. He therefore could not see why the power should not be left in the hands of the old constituted authorities, the justices of the peace, who are more likely to exercise their powers beneficially to the public. It would be a mockery to give it to the police, who were determined not to exercise it at all.

EARL GREY said, that the House should not pass the Bill hastily through

Committee; they should consider the measure carefully, and make any Amendments they thought it required, deliberately. He should certainly object to omit the clause now if they were to have it discussed on the Report.

The Earl of MALMESBURY thought the police were not fair judges in such a matter, seeing that the opening of these houses of refreshment would give them more work.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, there was a clause in the Public-house Closing Act which already gave the police the power of granting licences for special occasions; but it was held that that power did not extend to the issuing of licences to market houses opened regularly at untimely hours.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that the reason why the police objected to exercise the power might be that their work would be increased by the opening of public-houses.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, that by the Act of last year the police were authorized to grant licences for the opening of public-houses on particular occasions with the sanction of the Secretary of State; but that power had been held not to extend to granting licences to houses that required to be regularly opened, such as those which were required for the convenience of market people and compositors. This Bill had consequently become necessary.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON said, the police were justified in refusing to apply to general cases an Act which was intended to apply to special cases only. If this Bill passed, however, it would remove that objection; and the police seemed to him a safer body to be entrusted with this power than two justices of the peace, as proposed by the 5th clause. He suggested that it would not be discreet to make an alteration in the system established by the Act of last year until it had had further trial. A case, no doubt, had been made out on behalf of compositors and others employed at very late or very early hours, but that was no reason why this power should be taken out of the hands of the police; and he should resist any attempt to reinstate the clause.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, that a division had been taken upon this point in the other House, and that the House, contrary to the wishes of the Government, decided that the power should be confided to the justices of the peace. If the clause were now struck out he should move its re-insertion on a future occasion.

Clause *negatived.*

Other clauses *agreed to.*

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Tuesday* next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 151.)

PARTNERSHIP AMENDMENT BILL.

(No. 123.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, observed that its main object was to enable persons to lend money to traders and receive a share of profits without rendering themselves liable to the law of partnership. According to the law as it now stood, a person might lend money to any extent to a trader and receive interest to any extent without being constituted a partner or rendering himself liable to the engagements of the trader if he became bankrupt; but if he lent money on the condition of receiving a share of the profits he became liable to all the engagements contracted by the trader, and subject to all the conditions of partnership. He could see no good reason for the distinction between these two sets of money-lenders, or why they should be treated in a different manner. Since 1855 the principle of limited liability had been very generally applied to all large undertakings in the country, and it had been complained that they had thereby conferred an advantage on partnerships of more than six partners over the private trader. This Bill might, therefore, be considered as a complement to the Limited Liability Acts by placing private traders on the same footing with the great companies. In this respect the private trader would receive a great advantage, and at the same time he thought the creditor would derive greater security than he obtained at present. Besides enabling a person lending money to obtain a share of profits, the Bill proposed to allow a widow or child of a deceased partner to receive a share of profits without becoming a partner, which they could not do at present without rendering themselves liable to the debts of the concern. It would also enable a trader to give a clerk or servant a share of profits as a part of or in addition to a salary without making him a partner. This would operate as an additional inducement to the clerk or servant to exert himself in the successful prosecution of the business. These propositions constituted a measure which he believed would be found most useful to many honest and struggling traders, and to the public at large, and one which he trusted their Lordships would not refuse to pass.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

LORD ST. LEONARDS considered this the most important law in reference to the law of debtor and creditor that had ever been presented to their Lordships for consideration. The principles which regulated the obligations of partnership were well known. It was a perfectly established doctrine that if a man took the profits of business he must be content to take the losses too. This law had led to the flourishing state of the country. If a man entered into trade he did so with a view to profit. He gave to that trade the whole energy of his mind, his time, thoughts, and genius. It was on this foundation, the individual exertion of every man, that the prosperity of the country rested. But by this Bill the capitalist, instead of going into business and taking upon himself its cares and labours, would skulk behind some one else and escape all liability while receiving the return for his capital from the gains of the business. His noble Friend said that that measure was a sort of set off to limited liability; but limited liability was a dangerous thing, which had already much altered the character of trading in this country. It was greatly to be desired that the Government would take a comprehensive and statesmanlike view of the whole matter, and consider the general operations of all these limited companies, instead of asking their Lordships to deal with these measures piecemeal and one by one. Mortgage debentures would be floated in millions by these companies, and was it to be supposed that Exchequer Bills could hold their ground against them? It would be most mischievous to encourage partnerships in which men with a certain capital could sweep away the lion's share of the profits without incurring any risk or performing any labour. Wholesale traders took great pains to ascertain the solvency of retail traders, but a man's name might be over his shop door with nothing to indicate that he was not the master, whilst in fact a large portion of the profit might belong, under a private arrangement, to some other person. On the other hand, the shopkeeper himself, when he calculated his savings, would feel deeply his having to account to his sleeping partner for a large portion of them. These loans stood upon a different footing. They, to be effective to the lender, could not be concealed, and the borrower is still the master of his own trade. If an excessive rate of interest were taken, it would probably in the end lead to the ruin of both lender and borrower. By this Bill, if a man sold his business and reserved to himself the profits of half, he would not share half the liability, as he ought in fairness to do, but would escape altogether; while, on the other hand, if he retained the whole business in his own hands, he would be liable for the whole of the risks of the concern. That was something so monstrous that the very statement of it ought to make their Lordships hesitate in assenting to the second reading of that measure. A more dangerous blow could not be struck at the trading credit of the country than would be inflicted by such a Bill.

LORD CRANWORTH said, the Bill simply enabled a person to borrow from another a certain sum of money on certain conditions. Who did the present law protect—the lender or the borrower? Not the borrower, for at present one man might borrow and another lend a sum of money at an interest of 5, 10, or 15 per cent, or on any other terms that might be agreed between them. The noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord St. Leonards) seemed to think, however, that this measure would operate hardly on the creditor; but the creditor's remedy would not really be affected by it; it would remain as it was before. If the creditor recovered a judgment against the partnership he could take the partnership assets. Unless this Bill, or a Bill of a similar description, were passed, a very grievous injury would be inflicted on private traders, who had to compete with companies now having the benefit of limited liability.

LORD WENSLEYDALE was understood to say he had no objection to the principle of the Bill provided certain alterations were made in some of its clauses. His proposed Amendments would have destroyed the Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he should be sorry if the able arguments of his noble and learned Friend, which, in common with the majority of the House, he had not had the good fortune to hear with sufficient distinctness, induced any of their Lordships to vote against the second reading of this Bill, which had been introduced for the purpose of freeing the law of partnership from an anomaly founded upon an erroneous decision pronounced many years ago, and which had led to the most mischievous consequences. It was a principle of almost every system of jurisprudence that partnership depended on the conduct and intention of the parties, and that where there was a contract and agreement between the parties the law should declare the existence of a partnership, but that where there was no such contract and agreement the law should not force a partnership upon parties. There was one exception—where the parties had held themselves out to the public to be partners, the law held them to be partners, whether they had contracted to be so or not. But the principle of the law of England, as construed by a decision given nearly 100 years ago, went to the extent of declaring that in any case where individuals shared the profits of an undertaking they should be partners in the eye of the law, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary which they might have entered into among themselves. This was in consequence of an imported contract under which a person receiving in any form any portion of the profits was held to be liable to his last shilling. Such was the extraordinary rule of law to which the patience of the English people had submitted so long, solely from reverence for what was hallowed by ancient precedent. That principle was a most unjust one, and it was repugnant to the principles of English law. It had, however, taken its rise from the natural tendency of our courts to give validity to a contract if they could possibly do so. A case came before Lord Mansfield in which he found he could not do so in consequence of the very large rate of interest which would have rendered the contract void under the then existing usury laws. In order, therefore, to uphold the agreement between the parties, Lord Mansfield ruled that it should be upheld as a partnership. By general consent the usury laws, the parent of the principle of partnership against which this Bill was directed, had been done away, and it was time now to get rid of their mischievous offspring. In other cases the law of England had taken great care to prevent fraud. If a man handed over money or goods to a trader, that money or those goods were liable to the trader's creditor; but that was a very different thing from making a man liable to not only the full amount which he had lent to a trader, but to the last farthing which he possessed in the world. Under the ruling of Lord Mansfield, acted on by the Judges, the law invented a contract which did not exist, and then made the parties to that supposed contract liable for the fulfilment of engagements which they had never intended to undertake. The *ratio decidendi* was expressed in a judgment given in 1784: it was in the case of "Grace *v.* Smith." The Lord Chief Justice said the only question was what constituted a secret partnership: every man who had a share of the profits of trade ought to bear his share of the loss, and if any one took a part of the profits he took a part of the fund on which the creditor trader relied for payment. Now, in the present day, the absurdity of this was obvious to a child in a national school, for he would know enough political economy to understand that the profit or loss was realized after the creditors had been paid. Nor could fraud arise; the law of England had taken care to prevent fraud. If one man handed over his money or his goods by way of loan to a trader, so that he had the visible possession of the money or the goods, the creditor of the trader had a right to seize the goods or money so handed over. But to show the erroneous principles to which the present state of the law gave rise he would read part of a judgment of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Wensleydale) in which he laid down that the person who shared the gross profits was not a partner; and the person who shared the net profits was a partner. Such was the offspring of the old erroneous principle which was about to be swept away. If this distinction was read to any City man, he would toss up his head, and ask what was the difference between gross profits and net profits. But there was another absurdity. Now, where was the difference between the two cases? Again, if a person in trade said to his clerk "I shall give you £500, which you shall take out of the profits," the clerk at once became a partner; but if the employer said to him "I shall give you £500 a year if I make £1,000," not adding words stating that the £500 was to come out of profits, the clerk was not a partner. Such were the artifices which lawyers were obliged to make use of in order to apply this principle of partnership. They were obliged to go round and traverse and make use of subtle distinctions, which brought the law into contempt, because it put it at variance with the common sense of mankind. Trade contracts ought not to depend on subtle distinctions, or what was called "Judge-made law," but on the wholesome and well-established principles of the law of England. The object of this Bill was to remove an objectionable exception. It was a Bill of great importance to the community, for, if there were one principle better established in reason and common sense than another, it was that trade should be free; that mercantile contracts should be free; that those contracts, as far as they possibly could be, should be construed in accordance with the intentions of the parties; that they should be upheld by law, and take effect just as they had been intended to take effect. The principle which this Bill would put an end to had a very injurious operation as regarded encouragement to industry and talent. A man might be willing to encourage industry or talent by an advance of £1,000 or £5,000 towards a donbtful enterprize; but he was unable to do so because of the frightful consequences of those decisions staring him in the face. He thought it was time to declare that the law of partnership should be of a more liberal character and more in accordance with the English law generally. It had been the policy of our laws to make trade in land free, because it had been determined that property should not be locked up for longer than a particular time. The general policy of our law was in accordance with the principles of political economy, but the partnership law as it existed in virtue of judicial decisions was an exception. He trusted that their Lordships would give their countenance to a Bill which was wise and prudent in its design, and which would be of great advantage to the mercantile and commercial interests of the country. He believed that many of the social difficulties which now existed between employers and employed would probably be removed by the operation of this Bill. There were many classes of intelligent workmen whom wise employers would desire to bind to a concern by giving them an interest in its welfare, and making their remuneration depend on its success. That could not now be done, but if this Bill were passed, it would be possible to establish such a binding tie as this between employers and employed. If that were the result of the measure, he was sure that their Lordships would agree that a more beneficial and wholesome measure could not be introduced into Parliament.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY—PETITION.

Lord BROUGHAM *presented* a petition from the Anti-Slavery Society and said, that the Aberdeen Act had proved most offensive to the Government and the people of Brazil, and had prevented all the steps taken by the friends of the emancipation of slaves; that it had been most reluctantly passed in 1845 by the Lords who felt its extreme rigour; and that it was only agreed to by their Lordships on occount of the necessity of strong measures to suppress the slave trade. But that Lord Aberdeen had, both in Parliament, and in a written and formal communication to the Brazilian Government, pledged himself that it should be repealed if either the slave trade was extinguished, or the Brazil Government renewed the Treaty of 1826. Now the slave trade had entirely ceased and after thirteen years experience there was not the least chance of its being renewed. All the authorities were against it, the Emperor himself most decidedly for its extinction, and all his Ministers as well as the people generally, as the results of the election proved. Therefore the pledge given ought to be redeemed by the repeal of this Act which seriously affected all the efforts by the Society and others in obtaining Negro Emancipation, and was most hurtful to the great and valuable trade of this country and Brazil. The petition was, by the Rules of the House, only received as that of the persons signing it—these were headed by the highly respectable President of the Society, Mr. S. Gurney, on behalf of the Committee.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till Thursday next, half-past
Ten o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 13, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Expiring Laws *appointed* and *nominated.* (*List of Committee.*)

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Record of Title (Ireland) [Stamps]*; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation *; Fortifications and Works.*

Ordered — Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)*; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation*; Ulster Canal Transfer.*

First Reading — Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* [209]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3)* [210]; Ulster Canal Transfer* [211].

Second Reading — Theatres, &c. [64]; Kingstown Harbour* [185].

Committee—Greenwich Hospital [179].

Report — Greenwich Hospital [179]; Navy and Marines (Wills)* [188]; Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased)* [189]; Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions* [190]; Colonial Laws Validity* [183]; Colonial Marriages Validity* [184].

Considered as amended — Lunatic Asylum Act (1853), &c. Amendment* [196].

Third Reading—Prisons [141].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

PRISONS BILL—[Bill 141.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Mr. NEATE said, he hoped he should be allowed to urge against this measure those objections which he had not had an opportunity of offering before. He objected to the Bill, in the first place, because he deemed it to be an unnecessary continuance of a bad system; and secondly, because it delegated important duties to persons not the best qualified to perform them. The measure he thought was wrong in principle. The custody of prisoners was an Imperial duty, which did not properly belong to the magistrates. However skilfully prepared were the provisions of the Bill, he considered that the matters of which they treated were matters rather of administration than of legislation. Another grave objection to the Bill was the appointment of Governors to gaols, which under this system was left in the hands of the magistrates. He had had many communications with Governors of prisons, and they all expressed their dissatisfaction with such an arrangement. Another great objection he had to the Bill was its increased severity; he thought it a great stain on the legislation of the country that we should be employing prison labour on unproductive works. In all other countries, and in all ages, the labour of prisoners, however distasteful and disgusting in its character, was applied to some useful end. Labour for the mere sake of punishment was a form of torture. [An hon. Member: The treadmill.] The original purpose of the treadmill was that the labour which it provided should be productive. He had recently paid a visit to a French prison, where prisoners were confined under sentences similar to our own—periods of one to seven years. There was no solitary or separate confinement; the diet was 1½lb. of brown bread per diem, a pint of good soup of carrots and other vegetables every day, and with meat on Sunday. The prisoners were employed in productive labour, and were permitted one quarter of their earnings day by day, on the purchase of some little indulgence, amounting to about 2*d.*, receiving another fourth on leaving the prison. Prisoners worked together, and took their meals in common; but no conversation was allowed. The prisoners did not sleep separately, but the monitorial system was employed for the purpose of keeping order during the night—one prisoner of better conduct than the rest was placed over a cell in which several slept; and of course the warders paid frequent visits. The prisoners had also the liberty of seeing their friends three times a week. This might to some seem ridiculous lenity. It might be said that we were fitter to give lessons to the French than the French were to teach the English; but, in his opinion, it was more desirable to move towards lenity than towards severity. We professed to be the most Christian, the most religious, the most moral, and the most prosperous community in the world; yet while other nations were steadily pursuing a more humane and gentle system, our legislation was characterized of late years by a return to greater severity of past times.

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

GREENWICH HOSPITAL (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 179.]—COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 19, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 20 (Government of Hospital, &c.)

Mr. AYRTON said, the Committee having now disposed of that portion of the Bill which related to pensions, he desired to express his satisfaction that the rights of merchant seamen to participate in the benefit of the funds accumulated for the Hospital had been recognized by the Admiralty; but, as there might be some doubt still existing upon this point from the wording of the Bill, he thought it desirable that a declaratory clause should be inserted, to show that the

Greenwich Hospital was for the benefit of the merchant marine as well as of the Royal Navy, or that the House should have some distinct understanding from the Admiralty that they were not going to maintain Greenwich Hospital for exclusively Admiralty purposes. It had now become necessary that the hospital ship, the *Dreadnought*, should be done away with, and accommodation obtained in some convenient place on shore. To effect this object a sum of £660,000 would be necessary, which was a large amount to raise for a class whose relations and friends were limited to the shore of any particular country. In former times the Hospital was recognized as a public charity, and it was entitled to receive all the waifs and strays of the commercial service, such as the unclaimed property of dead seamen; but, for the sake of public convenience, this was afterwards yielded up to the Board of Trade, with the promise that an equivalent should be given from a fund raised by a registration of tickets; but the Board of Trade shortly afterwards came to the conclusion that it was very desirable to abolish this system of registration of tickets, and the Hospital lost the whole of the equivalent which it was to receive. The Admiralty were about to empty to a large extent the Greenwich Hospital, and if not converted to some more appropriate purpose soon, he should not be surprised to find the building turned into comfortable residences for officers of the navy. He thought a portion of the building should be set apart for the reception of merchant seamen suffering from the various diseases to which they were subject, and this arrangement, he believed, would result in great benefit to the navy, as well as to the public generally. He concluded by moving Clause 20, after the word "schools," to insert the words, "whether belonging to the Royal Navy or otherwise employed in any service afloat."

Mr. CHILDERS said, he would ask his hon. Friend not to press for the insertion of these words, because they would be misunderstood, and would really add nothing to what Government meant in the existing words, which were almost identical. On some of the points mentioned by the hon. Member, there was little to say. One of these was how far Greenwich Hospital was originally intended for this or that class of seamen; and this could only be settled by documents of the reign of Queen Anne. One thing, however, was certain—that merchant seamen had not for 120 years past any rights in the Hospital, unless wounded in action with an enemy or with pirates. The Admiralty had no intention to depart from the principles which they had formerly adopted as to the admissions into Greenwich Hospital; and with respect to schools, there was no intention to alter the course hitherto followed, and by which, under certain circumstances, children of seamen belonging to the merchant service had a right to the school.

Mr. LIDDELL asked, whether the members of the Naval Reserve had a right of admission into the Hospital?

Mr. CHILDERS: They have a right of admission—it is expressly reserved to them. With reference to the use of any part of the building for sick merchant seamen, he could only say there was nothing in the Bill which would prevent the Admiralty lending a portion of the building for the purposes of an hospital in lieu of the *Dreadnought*. He used the word "lend" advisedly, because in time of war it would be undesirable to deprive the navy of any space in the Hospital which might be wanted after a naval engagement. There were two sides to the question with reference to the granting of Greenwich Hospital for the use of the merchant service. It might be very charitable and considerate in the Government to give that service some advantage in connection with the institution; but, on the other hand, it must be taken into consideration how far the resources of private charity would be curtailed by the fact of this Government aid. The Governors of the *Dreadnought* hospital would, therefore, do well to see how far their support from private resources would be affected by its becoming known that they were receiving assistance from the public funds. He was afraid there were many of those by whom the charity was now supported who might say, "Government have taken charge of the institution, and there is no necessity for continuing our donations." The admission of these patients into Greenwich Hospital was a question which the Admiralty might fairly consider when it came before them. There was no intention on the part of the Admiralty to take away any of the rights which the merchant seamen now possessed.

Mr. AYRTON said, after the distinct statement of the hon. Gentleman, he thought it would be unnecessary to press the introduction of the words of which he had given notice. He therefore withdrew the Amendment.

ADMIRAL WALCOTT concurred in what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Childers) as to the difficulties which would attend the admission of merchant seamen into the Greenwich Hospital.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 21 to 42, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 43 (Devises, &c., for Hospital.)

MR. LIDDELL said, he trusted the Committee would excuse him if he adverted to a matter that was personal to himself. He had to complain of some imperfect reporting of the observations which he had made on a former occasion in relation to this Bill. He was the more anxious to explain, inasmuch as the Report to which he had alluded had occasioned some pain and dissatisfaction to the naval chaplains. Now, he wished to guard himself from being supposed to utter any reproach against a class of gentlemen who, he believed, discharged their duties in a manner most creditable to themselves and advantageous to their respective cures. He had simply viewed the question in the abstract, and observed that a man who had passed a great portion of his life at sea was not, in his opinion, the most competent person to discharge important clerical duties on shore.

MR. CHILDERS agreed with the hon. Member that it was much better to give these officers a retiring allowance than appoint them to livings in the country. But he, at the same time, wished to say that the hon. Member had used on the previous occasion no words which could cause pain to the present incumbents.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 45 to 50, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 51 (Repayment to Consolidated Fund.)

MR. LIDDELL moved, as an Amendment, to leave out in line 31, from "relates" to the end of the clause, his object being to guard against any attempt of the Treasury to lay its hands upon the funds belonging to the Hospital.

MR. CHILDERS said, it was only fair that the Bill which offered inducements to the inmates to go out of the Hospital, thus creating a charge upon the grants of Parliament, should transfer this extra charge to the Hospital funds.

SIR LAWRENCE PALK said, he could not see the justice of the arrangement, nor yet the advantage of it. The inducements given to live out of the Hospital should not be at the expense of that institution, and he hoped the Admiralty would re-consider the matter. He had the honour of being asked to present a petition from the Captains of Greenwich Hospital, praying the Admiralty, when depriving them of their position in the Hospital, to restore them to that position in the active list of officers which they would have occupied if they had not accepted of the appointment to Greenwich Hospital. He heartily concurred in the claims of those officers, which he believed were founded upon the most obvious principles of justice. There were three officers entitled to the flag if they had been on the active list, and he hoped the Admiralty would give their cases a favourable consideration.

ADMIRAL WALCOTT also warmly advocated the claims of those officers to be placed upon the active list, and said he should consider it to be an act of the grossest injustice if the Admiralty were to reject their petition. Those officers asked for no increase of pay, or pecuniary consideration. They only prayed to be reinstated in that honourable rank which they had been induced to surrender when they accepted the appointment in Greenwich Hospital—an appointment which they at the time believed to be one for the whole of their lives.

MR. CORRY also bore testimony to the justice of the claims of those officers. He had received a letter from one of those captains, stating that inasmuch as commanders, lieutenants, and others, were to be allowed this boon, he could not understand why the Captains should be excluded from participating in it. With reference to the case of Sir James Gordon, he considered it only fair that he should not only be restored to the active list, but he urged upon the Admiralty the justice of appointing him an Admiral of the Fleet.

MR. CHILDERS said, it appeared to him that the Committee had wandered a little from the subject of the clause under consideration. It was the wish of the Admiralty to do every justice to these gallant officers alluded to; at the same time it must be remembered that what they now asked was not a claim founded upon justice, but a boon of considerable importance. After the Act passed these officers would be in the same position as now, except that they would have nothing to do. When the time came for the preparation of the necessary Orders in Council to carry the Act into effect the claims of the officers would be considered. On the real question of the clause, the case was this. When a pensioner went into the Hospital his out-pension ceased; when he left the Hospital the pensions revived. By the present Bill, inducements would be offered to the in-pensioners to become out-pensioners, which they had no power to do at present; and the result would be a call for an additional charge on the Votes of the House. This additional charge would be repaid from the Hospital funds.

Mr. LIDDELL said, that finding the feeling of the Committee was against him, he would give way; but he would renew his Motion on the Report.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. CHILDERS stated that, after the Division on the Motion of his gallant Friend the Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay), although the Admiralty were not prepared to admit the clause for retaining a Governor with the present power and position, they were prepared to introduce a clause which would give power to the Admiralty to appoint, after the death of the present Governor, an officer, not under the rank of Vice Admiral, as Visitor and Governor, to perform such duties as might be thought expedient, and he would receive a salary of £1,000 a year. The hon. Member moved to insert a clause to that effect.

Mr. LIDDELL asked, was the office to be ornamental?

Mr. CHILDERS replied, that it would be as nearly as possible honorary; and it would not interfere with the office of Captain Superintendent.

Admiral WALCOTT expressed his gratification at this concession on the part of the Admiralty. It was most desirable that the Hospital should be presided over by a meritorious and distinguished officer. It gave *éclat* to the service both at home and abroad.

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Mr. CORRY asked, how the large range of buildings which would become vacant under the operation of this Bill were to be disposed of?

Mr. CHILDERS replied, that up to the present time no decision had been arrived at on the point.

Mr. HENLEY wished to offer his protest against the way in which this Bill had been smuggled through the House. He was in the House that morning up to a quarter past two o'clock, and he had certainly heard no intimation given that this Bill would be taken at a morning sitting to-day. He protested against such a course of proceeding.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had not been informed of the intentions of the Government with regard to this Bill. He was not aware that the right hon. Gentleman took any special interest in the Bill or he should certainly have felt it his duty to inform him. He had informed the gallant Gentleman the Member for Dublin County who was understood to be the usual channel of communication in such matters, and those who were known to take an interest in naval matters were, he believed, well aware that the measure would not be brought forward last night, but would be taken at that morning's sitting.

Mr. HENLEY must say that, as a principle, it was not fair to fix a morning sitting without giving due public notice of the fact, particularly after so very late a sitting as that of last night.

Sir LAWRENCE PALK concurred in the observations of his right hon. Friend. The course taken by the Government in respect to this measure was extremely inconvenient, particularly to the constituencies in naval dockyards, and other such establishments, some of which he had the honour of representing. Had he known last night that this Bill would be taken at twelve o'clock to-day, he should certainly have felt it his duty to watch it more narrowly than he was able to do from the brief notice which he received. It appeared to him that this was a most unfair way to press a Bill through the House in so thin a House, and when even the Treasury Bench was almost deserted. His right hon. Friend was perfectly justified in sharply rebuking the Admiralty for their conduct in this matter.

Mr. LIDDELL suggested that as hon. Members generally were taken by surprise in this matter, it would be only fair of the Government to fix such a day for the bringing up of the Report as would afford them an ample opportunity of expressing their opinions upon the measure generally.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS said, he was about making a similar request.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he was most desirous of meeting the wishes of hon. Members, and would fix Thursday formally for the bringing up of the Report; but on that day he would name such a day for the further stage of the Bill as would, he hoped, meet the convenience of Members generally.

Mr. HENLEY warned the Government that if they endeavoured to push measures forward in the way they had done the present Bill they would find they would lose time, instead of gaining it, inasmuch as the Members generally would avail themselves of all the forms of the House to delay their proceedings, and would find plenty of opportunities for throwing obstacles in the way of the Government.

Preamble *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* on Thursday.

THE POLICE AT PUBLIC BUILDINGS. QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether third-class pay, as well as an extra sum of seven shillings a week, is received by the Police on duty at Somerset House, the Tower, the Gun Factory, the Clothing Stores, South Kensington Museum, Chelsea Hospital, and Greenwich Hospital?

Mr. T. G. BARING said, in reply, that the noble Lord did not appear to possess very accurate information. The policemen in question did receive third-class pay, but they did not receive seven shillings a week, or any other extra payment whatever.

UNITED STATES—CASE OF THE "SAXON"—MRS. GRAY.—QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any and what progress has been made in obtaining compensation for Mrs. Gray, whose husband was murdered by Lieutenant Donovan, of the United States Navy, near the Cape of Good Hope?

Mr. LAYARD replied, that several representations had been made to the United States Government on behalf of Mrs. Gray, and a memorial from that lady had been forwarded to the American Secretary of State; but the Government of the United States had positively declined to make her any compensation, and Her Majesty's Government had been informed that after the trial which had been had, and the verdict which had been returned in the United States, they could not press for it.

THE PAPER TRADE.—QUESTION.

Mr. ASPINALL TURNER said, he would beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the Government did not recently institute an inquiry, through the Collectors of Excise, as to the condition of the Paper Trade; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay a Copy of the Correspondence before the House?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, in reply, that the Government had not instituted any inquiry through the Collectors of Excise into the condition of the Paper Trade, and there was no official correspondence upon the subject.

DOCKS AT BERMUDA.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he wished to ask the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty, Whether any steps are being taken towards the construction of effective Docks at Bermuda?

Lord CLARENCE PAGET said, in reply, that no Estimate for the construction of Docks at Bermuda had been laid before the House this year, but the Admiralty proposed to have the subject carefully examined, with a view, he trusted, to the presentation of an Estimate for that purpose next year.

METROPOLITAN PAVING, &c.—COMMISSION MOVED FOR.

Sir WILLIAM FRASER, in rising to move an Address for the Appointment of a Commission to inquire into the operation of the Act 18 & 19 *Vict.* c. 120, so far as the same relates to the paving, lighting, and cleansing of the Metropolis said, that the Act in question contained numerous clauses, but it might be divided into two parts for the present purpose—one relative to the government of the metropolis as a whole by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and the other the government of the districts of the metropolis by Local Boards, known as vestries. It was the latter of these only to which he wished to refer. The Metropolitan Board of Works had begun and had partly carried out works of considerable importance, such as the main drainage and the embankment of the Thames; what he had to complain of was the manner in which the Local Boards discharged their duties. The Act, in addition to constituting the Metropolitan Board of Works, continued these Local Boards for local purposes. There were forty-six of these districts, twenty-three of which were parishes, and the rest were combined parishes. It was the duty of these Boards, besides electing the members for the Central Board, to attend to the Paving, Lighting, and Cleansing of the Metropolis. Now, with respect to Paving, what had been the result of their labours under the Act? He asked hon. Members who had an opportunity from their residence in London of observing the state of the streets of the Metropolis, as well as the humblest member of the community, whether they were at all in a satisfactory condition; and whether they were not in a worse state than the High Street and even the back streets of the Boroughs which they had the honour to represent. Certainly, he could say, having had some experience of boroughs, that he had never seen a street in one of them that was not superior to Pall Mall, St. James's Street, and Piccadilly, which were looked upon as the aristocratic streets of the Metropolis. He would take St. James's Street as the *via sacra* of the Metropolis, and he would ask any hon. Member who had walked through it if he considered it was a fit street for a great metropolis? On the right-hand side was one sort of paving and on the left-hand side another; and when an explanation was asked of this extraordinary anomaly they were informed that it arose in consequence of one-half of the street being in one parish and the other half in another. He asked if that was a satisfactory state of things? He had found in the streets of London five different sorts of paving, and some were one-half paved and the other half macadamised. There was a parish in which there were two great leading thoroughfares, which, in order not to be invidious, he would distinguish as A and B. He had found that the vestrymen who inhabited A street and its neighbourhood were opposed to the amelioration of B Street, because it would improve the traffic and increase the custom of B Street and diminish that of A Street. Surely that could not be a satisfactory state of things. Lambeth district afforded a good illustration of his argument. If any hon. Member would take a walk into Lambeth, within a quarter of a mile of that House, he would find streets that had been newly built, and where persons of wealth resided, in a wretched state; and he asked if it was possible to find in any back street, in any other city or borough in the kingdom, a street in such a horrible condition as the High Street of Lambeth—a street leading from the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the establishment of a Member of that House. He had no wish to speak in particular of Lambeth as being worse than the rest of the metropolis, but he must say that the state of the streets in Lambeth, both old and new, was very disgraceful. By Section 9 of the Act to which he had referred it was clearly the duty of the Local Boards to keep them in a better state. He would next refer to the Lighting of the streets of the Metropolis. They had heard enough about gas in that and the other House of Parliament, and he would ask any one if he considered London was properly lighted? All he could say was that, having visited various continental cities, he had seen no gas so bad as that which was supplied in London. The lamp posts appeared to be such as were used in the days of our grandfathers when oil was burnt, and he believed an attempt had been made to adapt them to their present purpose. Besides that, the metropolis was supplied with the worst sort of gas. What was everybody's business appeared to be nobody's business, and the gas consumed in the streets seemed to be the refuse of that which was supplied to the houses. There was another thing connected with the subject which it might be considered trivial to allude to in that House—with regard to the lampposts there appeared to be a suspension of the laws of gravitation so beautifully expounded by Newton. There were not five consecutive lamp posts in London that were not out of the perpendicular. They were leaning in every direction, possibly affected by the intoxication of gas. The lanterns were constructed as if it was never intended by the original projectors that they should give out light, one-half—one-third certainly—of the light being absorbed by the sky, where it was not wanted, instead of being shed and diffused around on the streets and pavements. The next point was that of Cleansing the streets, and he asked hon. Members whether, during the last ten years, the streets had not been in that respect worse than anything that was to be found in the country. He could say that he had never seen a town so grossly neglected as was the Metropolis. Not only were the streets so constructed that it was almost impossible to cleanse them, but the gutters were so formed that the water would not run off except when there was an extraordinary fall of rain. When there was snow, as was the case last year, and as would probably recur every winter, the roadways and pavements were so completely covered with slush, mire, and wet, that foot passengers were covered ankle deep. In dry weather they suffered equally from dust; for the same evils which resulted from miasma were produced by the dust, and the same obnoxious materials were wafted into the lungs of human beings in the shape of dust as when diluted with water. Medical science told them that London dust mixed with water produced animalculæ, and no doubt when they inhaled London dust into the lungs a considerable quantity of these was taken into the system. Besides, the furniture in their houses was covered with dust, and the housemaids were kept at work dusting morning, noon, and night to remove it. These evils being admitted, the question was how to remedy them. Had the Local Boards been prevented from doing so owing to the state of the law or from their own neglect? He had no wish to run a tilt against the Local Boards, because he believed they had been prevented from doing what the Act intended by the difficulties which the Act imposed upon them. By the Act a certain number of Vestrymen were elected by the Ratepayers, and met at certain times and under certain circumstances to discharge their duties in that respect. The election of vestrymen had been described to him over and over again as a mere farce. A certain number of intelligent men were elected, and also a certain number of men to whom the word intelligent was not, in any degree, applicable. The majority sat silent at the meetings, being incapable of expressing a sensible opinion upon what was brought before them; the result was that the management of these Local Boards was left entirely to the few intelligent men; the latter naturally leant towards their own interests, and as the apathetic members sat still and silent, and the energetic members kept their eye on the main chance, the consequence was that the unfortunate ratepayers were left in the lurch, and very little was done for them. That was a fair representation of the present state of things, so far as he had been able to ascertain them. And now, as to the remedy. He was not prepared, like the Abbé Sieyès, with a constitution for every country ready drafted in the pigeon-holes of his bureau; but he ventured to suggest a means for more effectually carrying out the provisions of the Act and getting rid of the present disgraceful state of the streets of the Metropolis. It had been suggested that one great Corporation should be elected for the metropolis, which now contained 3,000,000 inhabitants, and would probably shortly contain 4,000,000—somewhat on the model of the corporation of London; but he thought there would be some difficulty in doing that, on account of the jealousy that might probably exist against it. It had been suggested that instead of having one great corporation, the Parliamentary boroughs should be made into Corporations, each of which should have power over its own particular district. If five or six Corporations existed in London he believed they would never unite to obtain such power as could be detrimental to that House or the Country: but in such a case it would be necessary for the good government of London that a Minister should be appointed who would be responsible to Parliament for the administration of those Corporations. He believed that under such circumstances a most excellent administration might be obtained. He did not, however, pledge himself to any positive theory on the subject. In the appointment of the Board of Works a new principle had been introduced, that of enabling the ratepayers to elect Local Boards, who in turn elected a central body. This principle, of course, was capable of great extension, but that extension should be made with great deliberation and care. It was a favourite assertion by many persons in and out of that House—he had even heard it repeated by noble Lords and hon. Gentlemen sitting on his own side of the House—that London governed and taxed itself, and that the State, therefore, had nothing whatever to do with the Metropolis. In that opinion he had never been able to agree, nor to see the justice of it. London was rich and powerful, and "a favourite has no friends;" and it was a city which could not be compared with any other either of ancient or modern times. Nineveh and Babylon were great, but never had their inhabitants so closely packed together. London was more than a city; it ought to be treated like a province, and, if properly governed, its taxation ought not to be limited to one description. In the opinion of many persons direct taxation was odious, and London if left to govern itself would, no doubt, raise a large revenue from indirect taxation. To take an instance, the revenue derived from hackney carriage licenses was £87,812; but if hackney carriages were taxed according to the principles acted on in other parts of the coun-

Sir William Fraser

try, they would only pay the sum of £41,147; leaving therefore a revenue of £45,865 to be appropriated by the Imperial Exchequer. The rating of London, exclusive of the poor rate, was £1,263,363. At this period of the Session, when hon. Members had so much else to think of and attend to, it would not be reasonable to expect them, in an expiring Parliament, to attend in Committee to the investigation of details bearing upon the cleansing, lighting, and paving of London; but he thought a fair case had been shown for the appointment of a Royal Commission consisting of men of knowledge and experience. No one could have lived in London many years without feeling some affection for the great metropolis, and some regret at the neglect exhibited towards it. The boast of the head of the greatest people of ancient times, of the most able administrator of the Roman Emperors, was that he had beautified his Metropolis; we could not hope to do for London what Octavius did for Rome —we find it brick, we cannot leave it marble; but we may at least make it a city worthy to be the capital of the splendid dominion of the Queen. The hon. Member concluded by moving—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission to inquire into the operation of the Act 18 and 19 Vict. cap. 120, so far as the same relates to the Paving, Lighting, and Cleansing of the Metropolis."—(*Sir William Fraser.*)

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he could not undertake to say whether the plan proposed by the hon. Baronet was the best or not, but he had certainly brought before the House a subject well worthy of its consideration. He did not altogether coincide in the opinion that London was bad in all respects. He scarcely thought that London, although it was certainly behind Paris in the matter of lighting, could with truth be said to be the worst lighted of all the capitals of Europe:—it was much ahead of Vienna, Rome, Berlin, and other cities. But its paving and the watering of its streets were certainly most disgraceful. The streets were repaired by throwing down broken granite stone, and, instead of using rollers, as in Paris, to smooth these down, the authorities in London allowed horses to do the work, at the risk of being lamed, and at great inconvenience to the drivers. The system of watering, also, was so abominably bad —a great deal of water being thrown down at one time and none at all at others, that sometimes the thoroughfares were covered with mud, and sometimes were filled with clouds of dust. In Paris the carts watered all day long, but so gently that the foot would hardly be dirtied in crossing the street. As soon as fresh materials were laid down there a cart immediately followed with sand and fine gravel, and behind this came water carts and heavy rollers, so that in two or three days the street was perfectly fit for use; whereas in London it might be three, four, or five months before the surface of the road was restored. When the Metropolitan Management Act was before the House, Lord Llanover pointed out that great inconvenience arose from one-half of some of the great thoroughfares being in one parish and half in another, and he suggested as a remedy for the evil that London should be divided into districts. He knew a case in which half of a street was four inches higher than the other half, and great danger to horses occurred. He begged to express his satisfaction at the prospect of something being done.

MR. TITE said, that the Metropolitan Board of Works was constituted for the purpose of main drainage, and for the improvement of the metropolis generally. For that purpose certain districts and parishes were empowered to send members to represent them at the Metropolitan Board. But the Board, he regretted to say, had nothing to do with lighting, cleansing, and paving the metropolis. These duties were left to be discharged by the vestries and parochial bodies, who desired to do the work as economically as possible, and by whom these duties were very imperfectly managed and discharged. Almost the only power possessed by the Metropolitan Board of Works was that a street could not be shut up for the purpose of paving, &c., without the consent of the Metropolitan Board. The solution of the question was in giving greater power to the Metropolitan Board, and he saw no use in issuing a Commission. If the Home Secretary would bring in a Bill to give proper powers to the Metropolitan Board of Works many of the evils now complained of would disappear.

LORD FERMOY would admit that there was room for improvement; but if the House decided that more money ought to be spent in cleansing, lighting, and paving the metropolis, the Imperial Exchequer ought to contribute a portion of the funds. When any improvement, however, was proposed for the metropolis, the country Gentlemen always protested against any grant from the public purse.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he admitted that the subject was one of considerable importance, and also of some difficulty. It was impossible to deny that the result of the present system was not in all respects satisfactory. The remedy suggested by the hon. Gentleman (Sir William Fraser) appeared to be one that would not necessarily involve an increased outlay, but might ensure a better superintendence and a greater uniformity of administration. He did not, however, clearly understand what advantage would result from the appointment of a Commission, because they all knew the facts. They were all aware that under the Act constituting the Metropolitan Board of Works, the construction and superintendence of the sewerage was vested in that body, but that the lighting, paving, and cleansing of the streets were left to the parishes and the vestries. These difficulties arose from the regard of the Legislature for the cherished principle of local self-government, and were very similar to the inconveniences felt before the passing of the new Highway Act in the management of the roads by parochial authorities. The remedy provided in that case was to form many parishes into a district, and to place the management of the roads under one superintending body. That would be a great advantage in the metropolis. The real remedy was in extending the powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works, which were, he thought, very usefully exercised. The subject was well entitled to consideration, and the House were much indebted to the hon. Member for bringing it before them. At the same time, he trusted he would not press his Motion for a Commission.

Sir WILLIAM FRASER said he was glad to hear the Home Secretary express an opinion that it would be better to place the powers of the present Local Boards in the hands of a Central Board. There was a great want of Ministerial responsibility in that House in regard to the government of the Metropolis. He should bring the subject forward on a future occasion, and he should not fail to bear in mind the opinion expressed by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey). He hoped before long to see London become a decent place for folks to live in.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lord Fermoy

IRELAND—BELFAST RIOTS.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. O'REILLY, in rising to move the Resolution of which he had given notice for an inquiry into certain charges impugning the conduct of magistrates of Belfast contained in the evidence taken before the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the recent riots in that town, said, that on the 9th of February the Chief Secretary for Ireland stated that the Report of the Commissioners on the Belfast Riots would be in the hands of Members in a few days. It was not, however, printed until Easter, and he therefore could not call attention to it at an earlier period. As an Irishman, however, he would frankly confess that if he could tear this page from the history of his country he should be too happy to do so. Were these riots but isolated outbreaks, without antecedents and with no probable consequences, the best thing would be to forget them ; but unhappily it was not so. The Chief Secretary for Ireland stated that the riots of Belfast went back as far as 1688. He (Mr. O'Reilly) would not go so far back as that, but he might state that during the last thirty years no ten years—no five years—no three years—ever had passed without riots of a serious character breaking out in Belfast. The last riots of this kind occurred on the marriage of the Prince of Wales. While all the rest of the Empire was rejoicing, the auspicious event was celebrated in Belfast by riot and bloodshed. The evidence went to show that there was no certainty that there would not be a recurrence of these riots, and that the only hope of their prevention was by the vigorous repression of the Executive. The Commissioners stated that there was, indeed, a danger that future riots would be more serious, because there was a probability that the combatants would be better armed. It was necessary to look back into the causes of these riots, in order that they might be avoided in future. In speaking of Belfast they were speaking of a place where the causes of disturbance still remained, and where the fires were still smouldering—

> "et incedis per ignes
> Suppositos cineri doloso."

The first serious outbreak occurred on the 8th of August last, and the riots were not finally put down until August 20. The list of casualties gave a total of twelve deaths, eleven of which were in the Report, and one other death had since occurred from a gunshot wound. There was one case of mania produced by fright—but it was necessary to state that this was not the mayor or one of the magistrates. Not less than 312 persons were wounded. The number of gunshot wounds was ninety-eight, of which thirty were serious. It was, indeed, difficult to ascertain the total number of persons injured. The market tolls fell off in one week £50, in consequence of the danger to the market people bringing provisions to market; and the sum levied at the last sessions for the damage done to the town was about £8,000. Was it nothing that one of the first cities in the Empire should be in the hands of a mob for twelve days, that twelve lives should have been lost, and that there should have been 300 people wounded? Now, what was the cause of so extraordinary a result? What was the conduct of the authorities of the town? The first and most remarkable fact was that though during the first two days of the riots the mayor slept by night at a small distance from the town; on the 10th of August he left for Harrogate. All were anxious to escape from the cares and toil of business to some quiet spot; and it seemed to him that if they desired a harbour of refuge—a bower of seclusion—Harrogate was the place to select, for they had it on the authority of the mayor, that during the eight days that he was there he heard nothing of the riots. Now, he (Mr. O'Reilly), with another Member of that House, was in Germany at the time, and every morning the telegraph flashed the accounts of the riots to Berlin and all the German capitals, and English travellers were horrified at what was called the civil war in Belfast. At the end of eight days the mayor heard something about the disturbances, and he returned to the town. But if the local authorities were at fault, what was the executive Government doing? The late Earl of Carlisle was at that time the nominal head of the Government in Ireland, but he was absent owing to his failing health; the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary was at Tamworth on family business, but he communicated by telegraph and gave the aid of his advice; there was but one Lord Justice in Dublin, General Brown; and the Executive was practically in the hands of the permanent Secretary, Major General Larcom. It was not until the riots had been going on for several days that 150 additional constables were sent to Belfast, and not until the second week that stipendary magistrates were dispatched thither. After ten days, however, it was found necessary to make a force of about 1,000 infantry, a large body of cavalry, and some artillery entered the town, and at last, on the 20th August, the riots were put down. The case was very different in 1857, when there were serious riots in Belfast, when Lord Carlisle, not then haunted by approaching death, was Lord Lieutenant, and the reigns of Government had not dropped from his hands into those of Major General Larcom. After the riots had lasted for two days the Right Rev. Dr. Denvir reached Dublin from the Continent and, upon hearing what had occurred, he waited upon the Lord Lieutenant. But Lord Carlisle was not the man to tell Dr. Denvir, as the right hon. Baronet had once said, that "he did not care two rows of pins" for what a Catholic bishop said, and the consequence was that prompt measures were taken and the disturbances were speedily supressed. That contrast afforded a strong condemnation of the conduct of the Government on the last occasion. One of the most remarkable facts connected with the riots was the mode in which they were estimated by gentlemen of position in Belfast. A magistrate and alderman of the town stated that the proceedings of last August were not riots at all in the ordinary sense of the term—the whole was merely a series of small faction fights. Far different, however, was the testimony of a Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. Isaac Nelson, who gave an account of the gutting of houses, and the destruction of property, and the hunting of Roman Catholics from their houses by the Orange mob. The first serious rioting occurred on the 8th of August. It was quite true, as stated by the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns), that that was not the beginning of the riots, but it was the beginning of the more serious riots. It was said on a former occasion that the cause of this illegal assemblage and disturbance on the 8th August was the procession in honour of laying the foundation stone of the O'Connell monument in Dublin. Now, that was a very Irish way of accounting for these disturbances; for the procession in Dublin took place at two o'clock in the afternoon, and the intention to burn the effigy on Boyne Bridge was known in Belfast on the Saturday before. On that evening the Sandy Row party, the Orangemen, assembled in their own district with guns, as it was admitted by the police that some shots were fired, and they burnt the effigy of O'Connell on the top of the bridge. The magistrates and police were present during the proceedings. On the following day there was another assemblage, when the half-burnt effigy was burned; and on neither of these occasions did the authorities interfere to supress these riotous proceedings. The turning point was the beating of helpless women as they were going to their work by the Orange party; and this it was that provoked that spirit of retaliation which produced the fearful rioting that occurred and devastated Belfast. On Friday the 12th August the Roman Catholic Female Penitentiary was attacked and wrecked, and the factory girls going to work were beaten. At this time there was an available force of 200 men in the town. Fearing the consequences the Roman Catholic clergy were appealed to. The Roman Catholic population were told that they would be protected; but next day a great deal of violence was again used towards the Roman Catholic women, and on the Saturday two Roman Catholic priests were fired at. These acts, and the absence of the protection which had been promised for their women roused the spirit of the Catholics. On Monday, August 15, the navvies, who were chiefly Roman Catholics, turned out and committed that savage outrage—the attack on the Brown Street schools. He had no wish to extenuate their conduct, but he wished the House to understand what was the neglect of the authorities which gave rise to it, and which led to the atrocious outrages that followed in every part of the town. He believed that if the magistrates had protected the women on the previous day, or given to them afterwards the protection they had promised, these outrages would not have been committed. In referring to the conduct of the magistrates, he should express no opinion of his own, but merely state the evidence on this point. True, that evidence was not taken upon oath, and was so far deprived of weight. But the principal witnesses were the magistrates, the officers in command of troops, and other gentlemen of position; and he submitted that their evidence raised a *primâ facie* case for inquiry. One witness deposed that on the 15th of August, when the riots were in progress, Captain Verner, a magistrate, was walking up and down the street arm-in-arm with a gentleman, and did nothing. Again, in the attack on the Penitentiary, a witness named Sullivan, who was connected with a newspaper in Belfast, stated that he was cruelly beaten and his head covered with blood, but that Mr. Verner, who was close by with a body of constabulary and must have seen him, made no offer of protection. Another witness stated that he saw two women apparently severely beaten, and that Captain Verner was within a yard of them, but offered no protection. That was evidence relating to a magistrate in command of the military and police which required investigation. On Tuesday, again, women were beaten when they were going to work. On the previous day the navvies, who were chiefly Roman Catholics, struck work and attacked the Protestant schools, and on the Tuesday the ship-carpenters, who were all Protestants, struck work at eleven o'clock, in order to have their share in the disorder, and marched into the High Street of Belfast. No police were there. The ship-carpenters broke into two gunsmiths' shops and armed themselves with guns, and marched calmly through the High Street totally unopposed by the authorities, who, as always happened in such cases, were round the corner. Now, he came to another magistrate (Sir E. Coey), who was in command of a company of soldiers. An officer who gave evidence said that he observed that the mob, a body of sixty men, carried rifles sloped in a soldierlike fasion; that he was ready to arrest them, but that the magistrate took no step whatever for the purpose. That was a matter which required investigation. While the magistrates were engaged in searching the Pound for arms, the ship-carpenters crossed the river in boats and passed down to the place where the navvies were employed to attack them. The attack lasted for an hour, and no police came up. When all was over the only persons arrested were two of the navvies; and it was stated by one of the witnesses that this excited a good deal of ill will among the people, because they expected that the assailants would have been arrested. On the 18th a still more remarkable occurrence took place. A man named M'Connell had been shot by the police in the discharge of their duty, and it was determined to make a party demonstration of the funeral. At two Catholic funerals the clergy refused to attend unless none but immediate relatives were present. The consequence was that those funerals passed off quite peaceably. But M'Connell's funeral, which it was well known beforehand was to be a party demonstration, was accompanied by a procession of 2,000 persons, and it appeared from the evidence that, though they were firing shots, no interference with them was attempted. The funeral, moreover, did not take the direct road to the churchyard, but went round, accompanied by the military and police, through the public streets of Belfast. The magistrates stated that they did not expect that such would be the case; but, nevertheless, they took no efficient steps to prevent it. The officer in command of the troops said that he had sufficient force to disarm the people, but had no directions to do so; and another officer stated that no attempt was made to arrest them. The procession might have been disarmed when it was crossing the bridge, and the reason given for not adopting that course was that the people might have thrown their arms into the river—perhaps the best use that could have been made of them. On their return, too, all these people might, according to the evidence, have been disarmed without any difficulty, but no steps were taken to effect that object. Such was the conduct of the authorities, and the House would now be able to form some idea how it was that the riots lasted so many days. He did not know that further inquiry could throw any light upon the conduct of the mayor, against whom no absolute charge had been made; but against the other magistrates charges had been recorded which he should be glad to see disproved, if they could be so disposed of, but into which a due regard to the character of English justice itself rendered it absolutely necessary that some investigation should be made. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That in the opinion of this House, the evidence taken by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Belfast Riots, and laid upon the Table of this House, contains statements so seriously impugning the official conduct of certain magistrates named therein, that equity to the magistrates so accused, and a due regard to the vindication of the impartiality of the administration of justice, require that a full inquiry into the truth of these charges should be instituted by the authorities intrusted with the supervision of the magistracy of Ireland."—(*Mr. O'Reilly.*)

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that he had no fault to find with the manner in which the hon. Gentleman had brought this question before the House; but he should have thought that after the discussion which had taken place upon a former occasion he would not have deemed it desirable, at the close of the Session, to renew that discussion in detail. The hon. Gentleman concluded his observations by giving a warning to the Government that the season of the year was approaching when, perhaps, the recurrence of these disturbances might take place, and said that the responsibility of maintaining the tranquillity of the town of Belfast rested mainly on the Government, in consequence of the changes which they had undertaken to make in the police arrangements. He (Sir Robert Peel) quite admitted that the main responsibility for the peace of the town of Belfast rested with the Government, and they were, he hoped, prepared to check any tendency towards the renewal of disorders, such as those which occurred last year. The hon. Member commenced his observations by saying that he should be glad that the occurrences of the past year should be forgotten; and he (Sir Robert Peel) thought it would have been better if the hon. Member had allowed bygones to be bygones, and permitted those events, as far as possible, to be buried in oblivion. Both parties in that town appeared now, he was happy to say, to manifest towards one another a better spirit, and it was not desirable that former animosities should again be raked up before their eyes. It was true that some delay had, as the hon. Gentleman had stated, taken place in laying the Report of the Commissioners on the table of the House; but the Report was ready long before the date attached to it, and it was simply to the difficulty which there was in having the evidence transcribed and brought together in one complete whole that the delay was to be attributed. For his own part, he had repeatedly urged on the Commissioners the expediency of producing their Report as speedily as possible, and the House would therefore, he hoped, be of opinion that the Government were not open to the charge which the hon. Member had made against them. There had, no doubt, as the hon. Member stated, been similar occurrences to those which he had called attention to in Belfast in former years; but the Bill which he (Sir Robert Peel) had recently submitted to Parliament would, he thought, exercise a material influence in checking such proceedings in future. That the elements of riot still existed in the town there could, he was sorry to say, be no doubt, and it was in appealing to the feelings of the better classes in it, that, perhaps, the best chance of extinguishing them lay. The late riots, as the hon. Gentleman remarked, begun on the 8th of August; but it was the fact that at the close of the first week the impression very generally prevailed that they had come to an end. That, indeed, seemed to have been the opinion of everybody on the Friday, and it was not until the following Monday that they burst forth with so much fury. The mayor of Belfast was present in the town during the first days of the riot; and then it appeared that, after consulting the magistrates, and he as well as they having arrived at the conclusion that the riots were subsiding, he absented himself from Belfast, in accordance with a pre-arranged plan, for the purposes of health. Now, he must say that he thought the mayor was wrong in leaving the town at such a time, and he himself must feel that he had not adopted a wise course in doing so, placed as he was in the responsible position of chief magistrate; but he believed that it was the opinion of the magistrates—he knew it was the opinion of one magistrate—that there was no danger in his leaving. He (Sir Robert Peel) was not, however, surprised that the mayor did not hear of the renewed outbreak of the disturbances immediately at Harrogate, for the first intimation which he himself had upon the subject, being absent from Ireland at the time—an absence which he deeply regretted—was from a French paper, which spoke of Belfast, *Ville d'Ecosse*, being flooded by a most serious riot. No more could, however, he believed, have been done than had actually been done by the Government of Ireland under all the circumstances of the case. In only one or two instances, as far as he could ascertain, had the military or constabulary force fired on the people; and indeed the great desire of the Government was to keep their hands clear from the shedding of blood—they were most anxious to avoid everything which could tend to the exasperation of the feeling which already prevailed, and they could not forget that there were at the same time riots both at Turin and Geneva, in which a considerable effusion of blood had been the consequence of the discharge of shot by order of the military authorities. The hon. Member said that it was only in the second week of the riots at Belfast that a stipendiary magistrate was sent down there; but he believed that more than one was sent down before the close of the first week.

Mr. O'REILLY: I quoted the hon. Baronet's own words. He said that in the second week of the disturbances additional magistrates were sent down.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: Yes; but two were also sent down the first week. He might further observe that it was scarcely fair of the hon. Member, although he felt sure that he had no wish to produce an erroneous impression, to allude, as he had done, to an expression which he had used on a former occasion in reference to an ecclesiastical dignitary of high position in Ireland. It was not through any want of respect for that personage that he had used that expression. He had done so in a moment of haste. He admitted that he was wrong, and the circumstance was one which he regretted. He felt sure he might add that the dignitaries and clergy generally of the Roman Catholic Church would admit that he was in the habit of conducting such communications as he had with them with the most respectful deference to their position. As to the riots which took place in 1857, and to which the hon. Gentleman had referred, he would observe that they were not carried on with the same intensity of feeling as those of last year. In 1857 Lord Carlisle did not take a very active part in the transaction of the business of the office, beyond giving advice on important questions, and recommending the course which he thought ought to be adopted; and he (Sir Robert Peel) did not think that any blame attached to the Government for not acting in 1864 as they acted in the former year. As to the attacks on schools and chapels, they had no doubt taken place—the Report was full of such details, and they were to everybody a subject of regret. He did not suppose the House was desirous that he should enter at any length into an examination of the evidence contained in the Report; but he must remark that, while the statement of the hon. Gentleman was, in the main, substantially correct, he did not think he was justified in seeking to cast blame on the magistrates. The Motion had reference chiefly to the conduct of the magistracy and of the authorities intrusted with the supervision of the magistracy in Ireland. Now, they had first to consider whether the conduct of the magistrates of Belfast had been such as to expose them to the judicial censure of the Lord Chancellor. There were several statements in the Report before them as to the conduct of the magistrates; but it would be for the House to judge whether they thought they had sufficient ground for any very stringent action on the part of the authorities. It might be that they had acted with want of judgment—that "they had lost their heads" on the occasion; but great allowance must be made for them, and the Commissioners said that, in their opinion, the existing authorities and police force of Belfast are not adequate to the future maintenance of the order and tranquillity of the borough. He did not think they would find a stronger accusation against the magistrates than want of judgment. He did at the time submit to the Lord Chancellor whether he thought it desirable that any action should be taken against the magistrates of the district. The Lord Chancellor said it was desirable to wait till the Commissioners had time to give their opinion; and he did not think any further inquiry was necessary — he thought the evidence given was sufficient to show that they had not acted with that prudence they should have exhibited; but it would be most unwise and even dangerous to set about an inquiry into the conduct of the magistrates after the investigation which had taken place before the Commission. He (Sir Robert Peel) hoped that inquiry would be final. Every one knew what was the great blot of the town — namely, the inadequacy of the local police; but he believed it would have led to exasperation if further action had been taken by the Government in consequence of these disturbances. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had referred to Mr. Lyons and Mr. Verner. Well, the case with reference to these gentlemen had been submitted to the authorities, and it was the opinion of the Lord Chancellor and the Government, looking to the depositions, that it was not desirable that any further action should be taken in the matter beyond passing the Bill now in its progress through Parliament. He did not wish to prolong this discussion. His belief was that a better feeling would spring up in the town. These disturbances had been the result of faction fights and animosities, the outbreak of which it was impossible for the Government to foresee. Every one would concur in the hope that in the future they would see a better state of things in Belfast. Its position, its prosperity, its character demanded that. If there was to be a rivalry in Belfast, for God's sake let it not be a rivalry of one creed against another creed, but of all classes in acts of forbearance and charity one towards another! Looking to the progress which Belfast had made under all disadvantages in everything tending to develop trade and commerce, what further advances might they not expect if all her sons and citizens united in one harmonious effort to promote her prosperity, bearing and forbearing one another!

SIR HUGH CAIRNS said, that in the course of the debate some observations had been made on individuals, many of whom were intimate friends of his, and he was sure the House would extend to him for a limited time the indulgence which was always shown when individual character and reputation had been assailed, and the defence had to be made through the mouth of a Member of the House. He might take exception to the course pursued by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly), inasmuch as in his speech he had gone into matters much wider than was covered by his Notice of Motion on the paper. He had given a history, according to his own version, of these most melancholy riots, and put his own construction on their origin, cause, and progress, and on the various occurrences that took place while they existed, altogether irrespective of the persons whose conduct he was assailing. Now, he wished at the outset to say that he did not intend to follow the hon. Gentleman in that course. He did not intend at present to resume the discussion as to the real cause of these most unfortunate riots, indefensible as they were, whether they had or had not a cause; nor did he intend to follow the hon. Member in the mode in which he dealt with the evidence before the Commission. The hon. Gentleman had selected such evidence as in his opinion made out his view of the conduct of the persons engaged in the riots during the time they prevailed. As he said before, no person could deplore the riots more than he did; and it was no consolation to him to say that one party more than another was to blame. He said much blame lay on one side or the other. The occurrence of these events was a matter they had all to deplore, and he certainly would not endeavour to keep alive passions which he hoped would now go to rest, by entering on an investigation which could do no possible good. But the case was altogether different when they took the Motion, which dealt with the character and reputation of individuals, and above all the character and reputation of that class of men of all others entitled to seek fair consideration both from Parliament and the public—he meant the unpaid magistracy of the country. In England they had boroughs where local magistrates were appointed. Their duty was in the borough. There was nothing of the kind in Belfast. There were no magistrates appointed for Belfast, except the stipendiary resident magistrate. Belfast was situated partly in the county of Antrim and partly in Down, and the magistrates of either county might act magisterially in that part of Belfast which lay in their respective county, but there was no obligation on any particular magistrate to leave his residence in the county, go into Belfast, and act in his magisterial capacity for the town. There was one magistrate—a resident magistrate—who received a salary from the country for the performance of his duties. It was his duty to perform magisterial functions in the town. The name of the Mayor of Belfast had been mentioned. That gentleman had filled the office of mayor for two successive years, and all who knew him must admit that a more upright, estimable, and sagacious man than the present Mayor of Belfast did not live. It was quite true that during his tenure of office the mayor was *ex officio* a magistrate, but it was not usual to consider that his authority superseded that of the resident magistrate. No doubt he was in the habit of rendering as much assistance as he could, but it was the resident magistrate who discharged the bulk of the duties connected with the town. The charge made against the mayor was, in the first place, that during the earlier days of the riots he slept out of the town. Now, Belfast was a business town, and there was not, he believed, a single magistrate who did not sleep out of it—indeed it was somewhat remarkable that the person who enjoyed the name of "Resident Magistrate," Mr. Orme, had always been permitted by the Government to reside two or three miles from the town, and was so residing when the riots took place. And that was the explanation of part of Mr. Orme's evidence when he said that upon hearing of the first appearance of a riot he came into the town, but it was all over when he arrived there. The accusation, therefore, that the mayor slept out of the town during the first days of the riot had nothing it it. The next charge was that he went to Harrogate, where, according to the hon. Member, he heard nothing about the riots for eight days. He (Sir Hugh Cairns) did not know what was the nature of the telegraphic communication between Belfast and Harrogate, or how long it ought to take to communicate between those places, but they had a curious instance of the uncertain way in which intelligence travelled in what the right hon. Baronet had stated—namely, that the first information he had of the disturbances was from a French newspaper. In referring, however, to that point he did not mean to attach the slightest blame to the right hon. Baronet; and he at once admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had given the most satisfactory reason for his absence from Ireland at the time. But to return to the mayor. He was in ill-health, and had been ordered to go to Harrogate; he had made his arrangements for going some days before, and previous to setting out had consulted the resident magistrate, Mr. Orme, who told him he might safely leave the town, and he went on the night of the 11th. Now let hon. Gentlemen be just in the position in which they stood. The mayor went on the 11th; he got a telegram on the evening of the 16th; and he started by the first train next morning for Belfast, where he arrived on the morning of the 18th. It was perfectly idle, therefore, with the knowledge we now possess of the facts, to do more than regret that the mayor was absent during those days. It was but fair that those who wished to judge his conduct should put themselves in his place. But in the meantime the Government had sent down to assist Mr. Orme two gentlemen, whose names he desired to mention as being among the most efficient of the stipendiary magistrates in Ireland—Mr. McCance and Mr. Coulson—who remained in Belfast with the usual resident magistrate during the whole of the period of the absence of the mayor. So much for the case of the mayor, to whom no impartial man would, he believed, be prepared to assign the slightest blame in connection with those events. He would next pass to the case of Mr. Verner. He should, however, first of all observe that the resident magistrate did not feel it his duty to call on any of the county magistrates to act with him until after the 12th, although the riots began on the 8th, and that he did not summon any meeting of the county magistrates until the 16th. But what was the case of Mr. Verner? Mr. Verner was a well known gentleman, a relative of the Lord-lieutenant of the county, and he was happy to say, was a personal friend of his (Sir Hugh Cairns), and he could state that a more firm, a more impartial, or a more prudent magistrate, and more humane man never lived; and even if he had not discovered some conflicting evidence in the Report—evidence which had been wholly disregarded by the Commissioners—he should say with as much confidence as he ever felt in his life, that the statement which the hon. Member had taken from the allegations of one or two witnesses could not be true. But the matter did not rest on his mere opinion, he was in a position to adduce evidence on the other side, which the hon. Gentleman did not give, and which utterly blew into the air the idle and malicious statements which had been made with regard to Mr. Verner. There was a great desire on the part of some persons in Belfast to throw blame upon the local magistrates; but it was a very curious thing that against not one of them, with the exception of Mr. Verner, was a single accusation brought. But it so happened that at the time of the inquiry Mr. Verner was the only one of the magistrates who was absent; he was in the south of France; he did not hear that a Commission was about to be held, and he did not think that anything would be done in the matter until the spring assizes. Now it was said that Mr. Verner saw two women being beaten by a mob of men, that one of them came and begged for assistance, that he had with him a party of seventy or eighty soldiers, and that he declined to interfere. But it was a remarkable thing that though there were seventy or eighty soldiers, and two officers, with Mr. Verner at the time, the witnesses were unable to identify any either of the officers or soldiers, though the officers must have been very generally known to the inhabitants of Belfast. Such a circumstance must be considered fatal to the credit of the witnesses against Mr. Verner. But two men of respectability, who did not know Mr. Verner, and had no kind of connection with him, the day after this evidence was published in the papers, volunteered to come forward and give their version of what had occurred. One of these was a Mr. James Fergusson, a Scotchman, who was no party man and had never been in a witness-box before, and he stated that he saw the attack on the two girls: that Captain Verner was not near where the assault was committed, that no appeal was made to him in witness's presence, and that he saw the whole transaction. Another person, Mr. James Hill, confirmed what Mr. Fergusson had stated; and so little weight did the Commissioners—having heard the evidence on the one side and on the other—attach to the charge, so utterly exploded did they conceive it to have been, that they did not deem it worthy of notice in their Report. With that explanation he would leave the case of Mr. Verner, and proceed briefly to notice that of Sir E. Coey. The charge against him was, that when there was a riotous mob in the street, and he was the magistrate leading a military force commanded by Captain Hale, he did not order that military force to disperse the mob and to take prisoners. Now it was all very well for the hon. and gallant Member, who had won such laurels on a well-fought field, to imagine that once they had soldiers they must have extremely easy work, and that all they had to do was to fight and conquer. But the House would remember the position of a magistrate in a case of that kind. The magistrate had with him a certain number of troops, he knew that he had power to order them to fire, to disperse the mob, and take the prisoners; but he also knew that if he gave those orders, it must lead to the shedding of blood; and it was the part of a sagacious magistrate to consider whether it was not wiser to allow a mob to pass off at a moment when he supposed it was not likely to do any particular harm, rather than force the troops under his charge into collision with it, when it was not doing actual injury to anybody. Captain Hale and Sir E. Coey were at issue in their evidence as to what then took place. He felt sure that they each stated exactly what they believed to have occurred: but everybody could easily perceive how the recollection of two persons thrown into the midst of a tumult of that kind might differ as to what had happened. Sir Edward Coey said that Captain Hale asked him whether he should order the troops to fire; and Sir Edward Coey replied, "By no means; nothing of the sort;" and Captain Hale said his question related to whether the troops should disperse the mob and take prisoners, and that Sir Edward Coey used words to dissuade him from doing that. Could anything be more natural than a misunderstanding of that kind between a magistrate and an officer? and could such a circumstance justify the language of the hon. Member's Resolution—namely, that the evidence contained "statements so seriously impugning the official conduct of certain magistrates" that "a due regard to the vindication of the impartiality of the administration of justice requires that a full inquiry into the truth of these charges should be instituted?" It was idle to assert anything so preposterous. The hon. Member also told them that on a particular day during the disturbances there were some three or four funerals of persons who had lost their lives in the course of the riots; that those funerals were largely attended, and that they became the cause of increasing disorders. Now, he felt sure there was not a Gentleman in that House who would not agree with him in saying that it was a grave error of judgment to have permitted those funerals to take place, accompanied by such numbers of people. But the hon. Member, in his zeal to attack what he called the local magistrates, had rather overshot the mark. Anybody who desired to know what occurred in connection with those funerals would find it in the Report of the Commission. There were in the town at least six stipendiary magistrates. A meeting was held in the morning of the day when the funerals were to take place, at which six stipendiary and three or four county magistrates were present. It was the stipendiary magistrates who were of opinion that the funerals should proceed without being interrupted; and not only were they of that opinion, but four out of the six were told off to accompany each funeral and take charge of it. It was a curious fact that at that meeting the only persons who suggested that the funerals should not be permitted was a county magistrate, and he was that very Sir Edward Coey whom the hon. Member attacked and accused of want of discretion! But Sir Edward Coey was overruled, and the stipendiary magistrates were assigned to attend the different funerals, with the consequences which the House had heard. The next magistrate who had been referred to by the hon. Member was Mr. Lyons, a gentleman whose reputation was well known in Belfast. The owner of a large property, Mr. Lyons had had the good fortune early in life to receive a legal training as a member of the Bar. For many years past he had, sometimes single-handed, always with the greatest diligence, as a volunteer, discharged what might be thought to be about the most disagreeable of duties—namely, those of a police magistrate in Belfast, in which capacity his services had been of the greatest advantage to the administration of justice. A more skilful magistrate from long experience than Mr. Lyons did not exist. But it did not at all, therefore, follow that he was necessarily the best man at quelling a riot when it had gained considerable head. The charge brought against him, however, was that, having gone to one of the funerals, when he found that the crowd was armed and was firing shots, he did not order the military force accompanying him to disarm it. And the hon. Member, in martial ardour, brought forward the testimony of Lieutenant Kennedy and Colonel Lightfoot to show that the disarmament might have been easily effected. Now, it so happened that there was then a greater military authority in Belfast than those two officers—namely, General Haines—who differed *toto cœlo* from them on that very point; and the Commissioners, being a little more impartial than the hon. Member, in their Report, after mentioning the evidence of Colonel Lightfoot, went on to say—

> "It is right to observe that General Haines seemed to doubt whether the crowd could have been so easily dispersed here."

When they found those military authorities differing whether it would have been a proper strategical movement to have endeavoured to disarm a mob under particular circumstances, surely it was rather too much to say that an unfortunate peaceful magistrate, who had never seen fields of battle, like the hon. and gallant Gentleman, was to be called upon at the spur of the moment to decide that he would take on himself the responsibility of ordering such a movement. The hon. and gallant Member also remarked that on a particular day—the 16th—the Lord-lieutenant of the county, Lord Donegall, came into the town, and the moment he appeared everything was reduced to peace and quietness, and a search for arms was made. But, if he recollected rightly, the Lord-lieutenant was in the town during the whole time, and if he had chosen to call out the *posse comitatus*, it would have been available; and, therefore, the very witness cited by the hon. and gallant Member went against him. He had now only to say a few words on behalf of two other magistrates—Major Mackenzie and Mr. Sinclair, who were mentioned on the testimony of a witness about which he would say no more than that any person who read it through would see what kind of evidence it was. The witness accused Major Mackenzie of neglect, and of refusing to perform the duties he was requested to discharge; but it turned out that, although Major Mackenzie was an officer in a militia regiment, and happened at the same time to be a magistrate for the county of Antrim, he had never in his life acted as one of the borough magistrates, his name not even being on the list of borough magistrates. Under such circumstances, he was justified in saying that he was not the proper person to act in the matter, and that one of the regular borough magistrates had better be applied to in order to secure the peace of the town. Mr. Sinclair, another magistrate, was accused by the same witness of neglect of duty. Now, that gentlemen was one of the leading merchants in the town, as well as one of its most efficient magistrates, having been appointed by the present Lord-lieutenant of the county. It appeared that, at the time spoken of, districts were assigned to different magistrates, and they most naturally and properly declined to act out of the districts assigned to them, and when a man came up in breathless haste to him to summon him to a remote part of the town, he properly refused to comply, saying that as it was not his district he would not go there. And so little did the Commissioners think of it that when Mr. Sinclair offered himself for examination, as every other magistrate had done, the Commissioners did not think it necessary to put a single question to him upon the subject of this accusation. He thanked the House for permitting him, on the part of those absent gentlemen, to make the observations he had done in their behalf; and he would only in conclusion remind the House of what the Commissioners said with regard to the charges that had been made in the press and elsewhere against the local magistrates in respect of what was called their want of firmness during the riots. They stated in their Report that there were some errors in judgment which the magistrates might have made; but beyond that they stated, in the words of one of the most sensible and experienced of the magistrates, that they were most anxious to do their duty; but where a large number of gentlemen were armed with the same power a diversity of opinion and contradictory orders were likely to prevail, and in consequence the military and the police were crowded together in some places, whilst others were not attended to as they ought to have been, which, no doubt, was the consequence of having no head over them; it was, therefore, hardly fair to criticize too closely the course that they pursued. They also stated that the prevailing idea was (and that idea he (Sir Hugh Cairns) thought seemed to prevail in the hon. Member's mind) that from the 8th to the 18th of August there was a series of increasing disorders going on in the town owing to the apathy of the magistrates. But the Commissioners stated that this was a mistake, and that whilst they felt their proceedings were open to strong disapproval in some respects, and two or three committed serious errors, they were not chargeable with such a neglect of duty, and that the subsequent riots were wholly unexpected. He concurred in the hope expressed by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that the measure which had been passed that Session with regard to the constabulary force would be useful on future occasions; but he did not augur that quite so much good would result from it as the right hon. Baronet did. He, however, hoped and trusted that the good sense of the people of Belfast would see, as no doubt they did, that these riots brought discredit on the town. and great affliction and injury to the people; and he agreed with the right hon, Baronet in hoping that for the future a better state of things would prevail, and that such scenes would not recur in Belfast.

The O'CONOR DON said, that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland had found fault with his hon. Friend (Mr. O'Reilly) for bringing forward this Motion on the present occasion, on the ground that the subject had been already discussed, upon the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Belfast, at an earlier period of the Session. He thought he remembered, however, that when the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) brought the matter forward the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) said that the House could not then properly entertain it, and that the debate ought to be deferred until the Report of the Commissioners, and the evidence they had taken, were in the hands of hon. Members; and it was that plea, and the feeling that the debate was in that respect premature, which induced many hon. Friends of his to abstain from taking part in it, especially as the debate on that occasion did not run very much on the occurrences which took place in Belfast, but was rather confined to the question of the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission of inquiry. The right hon. Baronet said, "let bygones be bygones," and deprecated anything calculated to revive ill-feeling and animosity. He could not see anything in the Motion of his hon. Friend of this character. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) said he would not go into the evidence taken before the Commissioners, because he had, on a former occasion, introduced a Motion on this subject. Yet upon that occasion he declared that he had nothing to say to the causes of the riots, but only as to the expediency of appointing the Commission of Inquiry. His hon. and gallant Friend did not by his Motion make any charge against the magistrates, but merely called attention to the fact that in public documents there were certain grave statements affecting the conduct of those gentlemen which ought either to be proved or disproved. The right hon. Baronet defended the conduct of the Government in the course it took to quell the riots, and said that troops and police were sent in force to Belfast sufficient to put down the riots. But the magistrates did not use that force, and that statement was, therefore, no answer to this Motion. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns), who had refused to go into the case before the evidence taken by the Commissioners was before the House, now quoted the testimony of two amateur witnesses in defence of the magistrates, and particularly of Mr. Verner; but that evidence appeared to him strongly to inculpate Mr. Verner. These witness said they were within fifty yards of the spot at a time when a woman was ill-treated—and the fact that they themselves did not interfere to prevent the outrage no doubt greatly invalidated their testimony; but they also said that Mr. Verner, with forty or fifty soldiers, was almost as near. The charge against Major Mackenzie and Mr. Sinclair was, not that they refused to go outside the particular districts allotted to them, but that they refused to interfere at all, because they said "they were so much mixed up with the people that they could not do so." These were grave charges against any gentleman, especially grave against any persons in the position of magistrates, and he had not yet heard any answer given to them.

CAPTAIN VERNER said, he would not have risen to address the House on this painful subject but for the personal tone the debate had assumed, and the manner in which the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly) and the hon. Member who had just sat down (the O'Conor Don) had spoken of a relative of his. The magistrates of Belfast might have behaved with indecision, or might not have been equal to the occasion; but they had never heard of riots where magistrates had acquitted themselves otherwise, and he did not see why greater sins on that account should be laid to the charge of the Belfast magistrates than any others. His cousin (Mr. Verner) had been attacked by evidence not received upon oath. There was a Commission sent down to Belfast which received evidence from witnesses upon whom no reliance could be placed, and some of them attacked his cousin, who, they knew, was absent from the town at the time. The hon. Member (the O'Conor Don) said that two volunteer witnesses had been put forward in defence of the magistrates; but his cousin had gone abroad before he knew of the Commission, and never heard of these witnesses until he saw it mentioned in the newspapers. His cousin, therefore, was not responsible for anything they might adduce; but he (Captain Verner) begged to say, on the part of his cousin, that he gave the fullest denial to all the charges brought against him, and treated them with the greatest contempt. Those charges, however, and the evidence by which they were supported, showed an *animus* which, he was sorry to say, had been only too rife in Belfast of late, causing the worst feeling between different classes. He ascribed the troubles which Belfast had experienced of late years entirely to the existence of a newspaper, the editor of which was one of the principal accusers of his cousin. Agreeing with the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that bygones should be bygones, he should be sorry to retort on the hon. Gentleman opposite by alluding to transactions in which magistrates of opinions akin to his own had exposed themselves to censure; but he put it to the House whether Motions such as the present were likely to bring peace to Belfast. The hon. Gentleman said he was only actuated by a feeling of justice towards the magistrates. The magistrates, no doubt, were very much obliged to him; but he thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman was the last person whom they would have chosen as their spokesman and defender.

MR. M'MAHON said, that while the Speaker went out to tea he had looked at *The Freeman's Journal* of the previous night, and there found an account of rioting at Lisburn, where an Orange mob had paraded the town with the usual insignia. The fact was that rioting was, and had long been, a permanent institution in the North—it was no accidental occurrence—and that no steps were taken for its prevention. At Belfast, where the riots attained to the dimensions of a civil war, the police were composed of young Orange lads, appointed by those most just and impartial gentlemen the Belfast magistrates. [An hon. MEMBER: Not at all; by the Corporation.] He was told that the young Orangemen of the surrounding district looked regularly for appointments in the Belfast police, and that the Corporation employed Orangemen and nobody else. The result was that these riots were continually occurring, until at last they reached such a climax that the Government had been obliged to supersede the local and substitute the general police. In thus removing, however, the humblest instruments of the riot, the Government had not done enough, for these men would not have acted as they did if their conduct had not been connived at or encouraged by the magistrates. Two instances had been given. The police in one of the affrays had captured only navvies who were Roman Catholics; and in searching for arms they had found arms only in the Catholic district. This showed a bias on the part of the superior authorities of the borough in favour of the Orangemen. He contended, therefore, that the House should go further, and instead of limiting the inquiry to the conduct of particular magistrates should inquire into the whole system of government in Belfast. Did the corporation of Belfast represent the toleration and intelligence of the whole country? As to any hope that rioting would cease, it was idle to expect such a result until you checked the dominance of the Orange oligarchy in Belfast and the neighbourhood. The barbarous bigotry of that part of Ireland was perfectly shocking. There was nothing like it in any other part of Ireland or in England. A distinguished writer had spoken of the barbarous bigotry of Scotland, and had compared it with that of Spain; and perhaps some of the inhabitants of the North of Ireland had brought their bigotry from Scotland. At all events, he was sure that until something was done to check the present system of local government in Belfast there would never be anything like order and contentment.

MR. WHALLEY said, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. M'Mahon) had raised the question from one of details to one of much general importance. When he characterised the peculiar feelings of the people of the North of Ireland by the term "bigotry," the hon. and learned Gentleman should have given some definition of the term. He agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman that the inquiry should be somewhat more extensive than was proposed; in his opinion, it ought to extend to the nature of the influence exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood at Belfast, and in what particular direction it had been exercised. The hon. and learned Gentleman stated that riots had taken place at Lisburn—but had no riots taken place in London and Birkenhead? The difference between Orangemen and Roman Catholics was this — that Orangemen only thought themselves aggrieved when their heads were broken or they were otherwise maltreated; but Roman Catholics had such sensitive feelings that they could not bear a particular song, and they could not bear to see certain banners, or to hear certain tunes. There had been that evening a manifestation of singular humility by the Secretary for Ireland, who had apologized to a dignitary of the Irish Roman Catholic Church for the expression "two rows of pins," said he had regretted this expression ever since, and professed the greatest possible respect and deference for the heads of the Roman Catholic priesthood. What did this mean? It must be because Roman Catholics were supposed to control the minds and feelings of the people under their charge; and, in point of fact, they received from the State some hundreds of thousands a year for no other purpose that he could conceive, except that of influencing the population on the side of order and good government. Well, then, it was too much to demand inquiry into the conduct of magistrates who discharged their difficult and responsible functions voluntarily and gratuitously, and yet not call in question the conduct of men whom we thus subsidised to the extent of something like a million a year. The Orangemen in Ireland challenged inquiry into the statement that never upon any one occasion within living memory could they be accused of beginning an attack upon the Roman Catholics. He contended that they were entitled to keep in mind the traditions connected with such tunes as "Boyne Water;" and this was very often the beginning and the end of their offence. This was called rioting. The suggestion that the inquiry should be extended was an excellent one; the Government should investigate how far the Roman Catholic priesthood acquiesced in or stimulated, or ought to have interfered to prevent, the riots at Belfast.

Mr. TORRENS said, the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. M'Mahon) that the Belfast police had been universally recruited from Orangemen was utterly erroneous, and was not borne out by the Report of the Commissioners, who said—

> "A reason analogous to that which we have been just considering, assigned for the distrust in the local police, is that Orangeism prevails to a considerable extent among its members. Of the fact that it does so prevail no proof was offered us, and the witnesses connected in any way with the force declared their ignorance of its existence among them; and generally expressed a belief that men who are, or have been, members of the Orange Society are not to be found in the police."

With respect to another point touched on by the hon. and learned Member, he might mention that of the twenty-two magistrates at Belfast, thirteen magistrates were Roman Catholics or Liberals and nine were Protestants, and he was sorry that the hon. and learned Member had not been a little more accurate in his statements.

Sir GEORGE GREY expressed a hope that the hon. Member who proposed the Motion would be satisfied with the discussion which had taken place, and would not press his Motion to a division. It was impossible to read the Report of the Commission without deeply regretting the events which had taken place at Belfast, and, no doubt, errors of judgment had been committed by various persons; but he did not think that the proposed inquiry would be productive of any other effect than that of promoting dissension. If nothing had been done it might be proper that inquiry should take place, but there was before the House a Bill, the principle of which had met with general concurrence, and the effect of which, he hoped, would be to prevent the recurrence of such disorders in future. He conceived that no practical benefit could result from the adoption of the present Motion except the revival of animosities which it was to be hoped were now allayed, and he trusted it would not be pressed to a division.

Mr. MAGUIRE wished to make only one observation. He admired the hon. Member for Lisburn (Captain Verner) when he stood up to defend his absent relative, but he did not admire him when he attacked a man who could not defend himself in that House—a man who was worthy of the respect of all who knew him. The hon. Gentleman had said that the morbid and wicked feeling which existed in Belfast had been introduced by one gentleman, the editor of a newspaper in that town. He had the honour of knowing Mr. M'Kenna, and he assured the hon. Member that Mr. M'Kenna could not be the author of the bad feeling that existed in Belfast in 1857, as he only went there two or three years ago. He appealed to the hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns)—the temper and moderation of whose speech that evening did him great credit—whether the manner in which Mr. M'Kenna had conducted himself before a Committee of the House of Lords was not such as entitled him to the good opinion of all who had read his evidence. If Mr. M'Kenna was placed in a position which called upon him to defend his co-religionists, and to expose abuses which every Irishman deplored, that was not a reason for attacking him for having instigated riots the causes of which he had laboured to vindicate.

Mr. O'REILLY, in reply, stated that he had himself made no attack on the magistrates of Belfast, and declined to take upon himself the *onus* of proving the charges made against them. All he said was, that certain allegations stood in record against them in the evidence taken before the Commission, and that those statements required investigation. He expressed his determination to press his Motion to a division.

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 39; Noes 132: Majority 93.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE.

RESOLUTION.

Sir FREDERIC SMITH said, he rose to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Ministers should now adopt measures for the construction of some of the Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Great Britain and Ireland re-

commended by a Committee of this House in 1858, and by a Royal Commission in 1859."

Much as he had regretted the absence of his hon. Friend the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Lindsay) from the House, he never regretted it more than on the present occasion, for if his hon. Friend had been there he would, no doubt, have brought the subject before the House, and he (Sir Frederic Smith) would have liked to have the honour of seconding him. His hon. Friend had devoted himself for years to this great question, and he (Sir Frederic Smith) was a humble follower. It was within the knowledge of many Members of the House that in consequence of the great number of casualties on our coast a Committee of the House of Commons investigated the subject in 1857-8. The Committee was presided over by the late Mr. James Wilson, and the Chairman and nearly every Member of the Committee were of opinion that harbours of refuge ought to be constructed, and that their construction would result in the saving of one-third of the number of lives and the same proportion of property that were now annually lost, and they recommended that a Royal Commission should be issued, as being more able to investigate the subject than a Committee of that House. A Commission was accordingly appointed, composed of men well qualified to conduct such an inquiry. Sir James Hope, one of the best officers in the naval service, presided; and the late Admiral Washington, Hydrographer of the Navy, Admiral Sullivan, and other men of ability and experience, as naval officers and engineers, and the Member for Sunderland and himself were Members of the Commission. They examined witnesses at every port in the kingdom, and they reported in favour of the formation of various harbours of refuge, giving estimates for the works which they recommended, and in short coming to conclusions not very different from those of the Committee. As showing the accuracy of the calculations made by the Commissioners, he might observe that contractors were to be found who would undertake the construction of those harbours of refuge at the estimated cost. Unfortunately the Report of the Commissioners was followed up by a document emanating from the Board of Trade in 1861—the work of a civilian, though of great talent, yet totally unfit, from his want of knowledge of nautical affairs, for the task. If his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade, with his great nautical skill, had drawn up that document of course the result would, no doubt, have been different. The document of 1861 attacked the Commissioners' Report as to the estimates and the probable saving of life and property, and the Commissioners were accused of speaking of the foundering of vessels as if such foundering could be avoided by harbours of refuge. But was not the cause of these disasters the very fact that harbours of refuge did not exist? The harbours on the East coast were tidal harbours, and could only be entered at or nearly at the top of the tide. It was well known that the very wind which stopped the laden vessels coming from the north was the wind which took the light vessels down from the south, and that at Flamborough Head collisions took place, and that these collisions would not take place if harbours of refuge were provided, as the laden vessels would put in there, and the light vessels would pass on to their destination. They were told by the document in question that the age of vessels was a fruitful cause of destruction and wreck. What said the Wreck Report of 1863? Why, that the great majority of vessels lost did not in age exceed seven years. Another cause assigned by the document of 1861 for this loss of vessels was bad seamanship. How could this be proved when, in most cases, all hands were lost? The statistics of the Wreck Chart of 1863 gave some extraordinary facts. The annual average of wrecks for eight years to 1862, inclusive, amounted to 1,298; in 1863 they were no less than 1,664—and no wonder, looking at the vast increase that had taken place in our shipping. In the year 1843 the total tonnage of the United Kingdom was 7,000,000 odd British, and the foreign 2,600,000, or an aggregate of more than 9,000,000 tons. At the present moment the aggregate was not 9,000,000, but actually 26,000,000 tons—17,000,000 British, in and out—9,000,000 foreign, in and out; showing an increase quite marvellous. But this great increase in tonnage made the necessity for harbours of refuge still greater. No sailor would get up in that House or elsewhere and say that harbours of refuge were not needed for our coasting trade, for it was in that trade that the casualties chiefly occurred. Notwithstanding that the coal trade was now chiefly carried on by means of steamers, yet the casualties in that branch were still increasing. The total number for the five years ending 1858 was

5,594, but in the five years which followed it had risen to 7,441, being an increase of 1,847 in five years. This was a question of humanity. We were spending money in all directions on objects which were not necessary, and yet in a matter of this sort, where lives were to be saved, the Government would not spend a single farthing. Much stress had been laid upon the adoption of one of the recommendations of the Commissioners to lend money to inhabitants of places willing to construct harbours of refuge on their own account; but where were the Government themselves forming such harbours? 700 or 800 of our sailors and marines were lost every year, and in 1863 there were lost 2,001 ships, of these 1,600 were known to be British, and of them 443 were foreign going ships; and therefore the large proportion of the entire must have been coasters; 533 were total wrecks, 332 owing to stress of weather, and only 31 from defects of ship. These were facts which the President of the Board of Trade ought to take into account. With regard to the cost there had been great exaggeration, and some stress had been laid on the different estimates made by the Committee and the Commission. The Committee only recommended an expenditure of £2,000,000, but when the Commissioners went about and inspected the various sites they found it necessary to increase the number of harbours and the expenditure. Certainly, as one of the Commissioners, he could say that they had entered on their task with an anxious desire to do their duty to the country. For himself, he could say that he had never undertaken any duty with more anxiety, and while desirous not to impose any unnecessary charge on the taxpayers, he was also desirous to provide places of safety for these poor mariners. In the report to which he had alluded it was said that so much was not needed for the East coast, but the Returns showed that it was on the East coast that the casualties chiefly occurred. The value of property lost in the last five years amounted to £4,292,812, and that, without taking into account the loss of life, was a matter of some importance to a commercial country. The Returns showed that 8,114 sailors were lost in the same period, a great portion of whom would have been saved had there been harbours of refuge. That was surely a matter of national importance, and one which the Government might well be asked to consider. He was one of a deputation of Members of the House of Commons who waited on the Prime Minister; and the noble Lord, having listened for two hours to their tale of sorrow, gave them reason to believe that his sympathies were with the sailors, and that he would turn his attention to the subject. He (Sir Frederic Smith) hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would devote a portion of his surplus to the relief of the sailors, the only class for which he had as yet done nothing. Of the wrecks and casualties for five years, which amounted to 1,971, there were 1,200 from stress of weather, and the men lost in the ten years would have been enough to man fifteen or twenty line-of-battle ships. The scope of the Motion did not point out what was to be done, but left to the Government to consider what most required assistance. In 1863 he brought forward a much narrower Motion, in which he specified the harbours of Wick, Carlingford, and Waterford; but it was raised as an objection that, in thus selecting harbours, he was taking the matter out of the hands of the Government; but that could not be said upon the present occasion. He only wished that the hon. Member for Sunderland had been present with his manly eloquence and practical knowledge to support him upon this occasion. It was said that shipowners did not care for those harbours; but it was natural that in the case of large vessels they would not, for these were sent out to sea, and avoided the dangers of the coast. It was in behalf of the coasters, which were liable to be dashed on a rock-bound coast, that he spoke. But it was objected that these were too fully laden. If they did not take heavy cargoes they could not compete with the railways, and the trade would leave them, and thus the best school for the navy would be lost to the country. Then it was said that harbours of refuge would tempt men to go to shore when they ought to keep out at sea; but this was absurd. It might be said that the estimates for this subject could not be relied on. He admitted that the estimates of the Committee were not sufficiently detailed and carefully prepared; but those prepared by the Commission were made by competent men, who would be responsible that the works would be done for the money; and although Holyhead and Portland were given as instances of harbours the construction of which exceeded the estimates for them, it was to be recollected that the change was the cause of the increase in the plans made by successive Governments. If an action took place between the Humber and the Firth of Forth there was no harbour into which a disabled man-of-war could betake itself, and it would be liable to be dashed ashore not being able to weather the headland. All that was wanted was a sum of £1,340,000 to be spread over a period of ten years, or an annual outlay of £134,000, which would be sufficient for the construction of harbours along the most important points on our coast—harbours that would lead to the saving of a vast amount of life; and it would be niggardly, on the part of this great country, to refuse so moderate an expenditure for the accomplishment of so desirable an object. The hon. and gallant Member concluded by moving the Resolution.

MR. BLAKE, in seconding the Motion, said, that although Waterford Harbour was one of those recommended for a refuge, it was not altogether on that account he desired the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend to pass, as the entrance to the port was deep enough for the local shipping; but many of his constituents were shipowners, and a large number of the inhabitants followed maritime pursuits; both classes were therefore interested in having proper precautions taken round the coasts of the United Kingdom for the preservation of life and property from shipwreck. In selecting Waterford as an instance of the good that might be done in that way for a small outlay, he only did so because he was better acquainted with it than with any of the other harbours of refuge recommended. He must express his regret that the recommendations of the Committee and of the Commission had not been carried into effect. The hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Lindsay), who had rendered such important services in reference to this question, had shown that during ten years the average loss of life on the coast had been 800, and of property £1,500,000; and he had expressed his opinion that from the increase of trade these losses would probably be increased during the next ten years unless harbours of refuge were constructed. His hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Frederic Smith) had appealed to the humanity of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson); but he (Mr. Blake) was not sanguine as to the success of the appeal, because he feared that the holding of office had rather hardened than softened the heart of that right hon. Gentleman. It would be interesting to contrast the sentiments of the right hon. Gentleman as expressed by him five years since with those to which he gave utterance the previous Session. In 1860 the right hon. Gentleman admitted the necessity which existed for the construction of those harbours of refuge, and repudiated any intention on the part of the Government of attempting to shuffle out of the Resolution which the House had arrived at upon this subject. The noble Lord at the head of the Government on the same occasion admitted the absolute necessity which existed for the construction of these works. A year or so afterwards the right hon. Gentleman introduced the Harbours Improvement Bill, a very useful measure, undoubtedly, but not calculated to afford any compensation for the absence of those harbours of refuge. As he had said, his (Mr. Blake's) constituents did not personally suffer from the want of a harbour of refuge at Waterford, because the harbour was at present sufficiently deep for the purposes of the local trade; but nine-tenths of the English ships going to America passed close to the harbour, and those large ships could only enter it at particular states of the tide. In 1861 eight, and between 1850 and 1860 forty-two large vessels were lost close upon the coast of Waterford, and not one of those vessels intended entering the harbour. Between 1850 and 1860, 673 lives were lost in the same neighbourhood. No doubt it might be urged that a good many of these vessels would still have been lost even if the harbour had been improved, and he was not disposed to deny that this would have been the case; but still the benefit would be incalculable if only the small sum of £50,000, which was all they asked for, were expended. Harbours of refuge were also very much wanted for our new iron-clad fleet, which, though very well suited for attack and defence, were not so well qualified to contend with a tempestuous sea. It had been said that most of the vessels lost were insured, but the loss of property was still the same, although it was shifted on to other shoulders; and, in addition, there was heavy loss of life. It might also be said that a great many of the vessels would still be lost even if there were harbours of refuge; but if only one-sixth of the loss were prevented this would be amply sufficient to justify the proposed expenditure. He earnestly joined in the appeal made to the House by his hon. and gallant Friend, believing, as he did, that the interests of commerce and the claims of humanity were alike affected.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Ministers should now adopt measures for the construction of some of the Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Great Britain and Ireland, recommended by a Committee of this House in 1858, and by a Royal Commission in 1859."—(*Sir Frederic Smith.*)

Mr. GRANT DUFF: I do not rise to advocate the claims of any particular port, for this seems to me hardly a fitting time to do so. I cannot, however, help expressing my regret at the apathy which the Government has shown with respect to this question since the departure from England of that most able public servant, Mr. James Wilson, who had it so much at heart, and whose premature death in a distant portion of the empire was not the least of the misfortunes which have fallen upon the Liberal party during the continuance of the Parliament that is now drawing to a close. That nothing should have been done during the earlier years of that Parliament towards carrying out even the schemes of the Royal Commission, is intelligible enough, for vast and immediate national exigencies had to be satisfied, which left no sufficient surplus in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do trust, however, that the right hon. Gentleman who presides over the Board of Trade will give us to-night some brighter hopes for the future. Making due allowance for the unseaworthy state in which vessels are too often sent out, and for those chances and changes of the seas which harbours of refuge could not remedy, I do think that such harbours would, if judiciously placed, be of great benefit. Before I sit down, I wish to say a few words on another subject. It seems to me that the nation would find its advantage in aiding the seafaring population of Scotland, and probably of other parts of the United Kingdom, in obtaining better boat refuges than are at present at their command. The size of fishing boats has much increased of late years upon our north-eastern coast, and harbours which might once have answered very well, are now quite inadequate. In the long nights of summer as many as 10,000 men are often at sea in the Moray Firth, and if a sudden gale comes on are placed in the greatest danger. I should like to see the Government take this matter seriously in hand, and whether by a Commission or otherwise investigate the question, whether—as was suggested by my hon. Friend the Member for Banffshire—some additional small portion of the taxation which Scotland pays to the Imperial Treasury might not be applied to making boat refuges at various points on the south side of the Moray Firth, as well as at whatever other points in other parts of Scotland there may be proved to be an equally pressing need.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON observed, that the Resolution they were called on to affirm was in these words:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Ministers should now adopt measures for the construction of some of the Harbours of Refuge on the Coast of Great Britain and Ireland recommended by a Committee of this House in 1857, and by a Royal Commission in 1859."

Now, he begged to remind the House that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had not advised them to really carry out the recommendation of the Committee. What was the recommendation of the Committee over which the lamented James Wilson presided? The recommendation was to spend £2,000,000 on harbours of refuge; but, looking to the considerable benefit which was to be conferred on the shipping interest by the saving of their property, the Committee also recommended that three-fourths of the cost of those harbours of refuge and three-fourths of the expenses of their maintenance, should be defrayed by the shipping interest to be benefited by the outlay. Now, the shipping interest objected altogether to pay for harbours of refuge. They had never so appreciated the benefit to their property by the construction of these harbours as to be willing to submit to any toll or tax for their construction and maintenance. Then as to the Commission, it was not authorized to make any recommendation to Parliament on the question of finance. All it was authorized to do was to point out what were the sites on which harbours of refuge might be most advantageously constructed by the outlay of £2,000,000, which the Committee had recommended should be expended It must strike every one as most extraordinary, if all those millions of property were to be saved by so small an expenditure, that the great shipping interest of England should be unwilling to contribute to that outlay. If the benefit was so indisputable, why was this case to be an exception to all rules? why were they to find that a great interest could not be made sensible of the benefits which harbours of refuge were to confer on it and willing to contribute to their construction? He received a few days since a deputation from shipowners urging the erection of a lighthouse upon the eastern coast of England in order to facilitate the navigation. He asked at once whether they were willing to pay the requisite tolls. The reply was, certainly; they were quite willing to pay the additional toll that would be cast on them, because they were convinced of its utility; but he could truly say that since he had been connected with the Board of Trade he had never had, to his recollection, any representation from any shipowners on the subject of these harbours of refuge. On the contrary, so far as his communications had gone with them, they had shown in some cases, if not opposition, at least great indifference. He had not found the same indifference in the persons inhabiting the particular localities in which it was proposed to expend these large sums of money. The hon. and gallant Member proposed as the best sites Filey, Wick, Waterford, and Carlingford. [Sir FREDERIC SMITH: That was in 1863; now he left the matter entirely in the hands of the Government.] He must decline the responsibility of agreeing to such a Resolution. It would be very unwise and imprudent for the House to bind itself by a proposition so very indefinite as this. He did not deny that it was a great advantage when a ship was in difficulties to have a good port under her lee, but he entirely denied that there was any evidence to show, if the larger expenditure recommended on particular harbours of refuge on the coasts of the United Kingdom took place, it would have any perceptible effect on the loss of life which unfortunately took place annually on our coast and in seas adjacent to the coast. He held in his hand a statement of the number of lives lost in certain districts on the coast of the United Kingdom. In 1863 the whole number of lives lost on the coast of the United Kingdom was 620. That was considerably less than the average of the last five years—the average being 875. But if they took the lives lost actually on the coast, in order to see what benefit harbours of refuge would give, they must to a great extent confine themselves to ships lost along the coast and in a situation to avail themselves of harbours of refuge. The total loss on the coast during 1863 was 330, which was nearly 400 below the average of the previous five years. There were many losses during the last year, but they were not attributable to the absence of harbours of refuge in this country, but rather to those violent westerly gales which drove many vessels on the coast of Holland. Taking the year 1863, he found that between the Farn Islands and Flamborough Head there were in all only three lives lost; so that if a harbour of refuge had been constructed at Filey that was the highest amount of life which could by its means have, during the year, possibly been saved. But it was not on the east coast that the greatest loss of life occurred—it was between the Skerries, Lambay, and Fair Head; it was where lesser sacrifice of life took place that the hon. and gallant Gentleman wanted to have harbours of refuge constructed. Be that as it might, he would venture to say that any hon. Gentleman who took the trouble to enter into the statistics on the subject which had been laid before the House, in a fair and impartial spirit, could not fail to arrive at the conclusion that the harbours of refuge which the hon. and gallant Member recommended would have but a very small effect in reducing the loss of life on the coasts of these kingdoms. There was, he might add, a gradually increasing saving of life on our coasts. By a judicious and, he was happy to say, successful expenditure on lifeboats, rocket apparatus, and such other appliances as could with facility be made available at the spot required, much had been effected in the saving of lives. In the case of a ship in danger, there was comparatively small chance of her being in such a position as to be able to avail herself of the shelter of a single harbour on a considerable extent of coast; but if the appliances which he had just mentioned were placed along the whole coast, ships, when stranded, would almost invariably find that aid could be afforded and life saved. There had, he might observe, of late years been many important changes in the law, all tending to the saving of life from shipwreck. At the present moment, under the operation of a Bill which had been introduced by his right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Colonies, there was a salvage claim on ships for the rescue of lives therefrom, which had been recently extended to the cargoes, so that an inducement was held out to persons to exert themselves for the purpose of saving life as well as property. Bounties for the saving of life were also given out of the Mercantile Marine Fund, and his belief was that such means tended to secure the end which they who advocated the construction of harbours of refuge professed to have in view. He, at all events, felt satisfied that the construction of one or two such harbours would not be followed by the results which they seemed to imagine. While these were the views which he entertained on the subject, he retained the opinion that it was desirable to aid voluntary efforts in improving the harbours which were already in existence, and which were the natural places of resort for large numbers of vessels. That had been done to a considerable extent under the Harbours Act. Up to the present time, under the Harbours Act, money to the amount of £1,000,000 had been advanced, or promised to be advanced at a low rate of interest. The money so advanced had been laid out in many cases in the actual improvement of the entrances to harbours, where formerly vessels were compelled to lie outside during the long nights under circumstances of great danger; and it would, he thought, be found that sailors preferred bearing up for their own port, though it might be more distant, to putting into a strange harbour, where they, perhaps, had no friends or connections. In the case of the Tyne £100,000 had been advanced. At Wick, too, the people had set to work themselves, and were receiving under the Harbours Act, something like £60,000. They had applied for £20,000, and their request was under consideration. Other harbours, the names of which he could mention, had also received sums of money. Carlingford, he believed, had obtained a provisional order, and was applying for an advance from the Public Works Loan Commissioners. Now, that appeared to him to be a more wholesome system than the giving the grants to places through the operation of Parliamentary influence in that House. The grants were made at a lower rate of interest than that at which the money could be obtained in the market, and were therefore so far in favour of the particular localities which received them; but they were advanced, on good security, to persons who were desirous of helping themselves, and who were engaged in many cases in the improvement of harbours which were likely to contribute to the saving of ships and life. He hoped, under all these circumstances, the question having repeatedly been discussed before, that the House would not assent to the Resolution of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite.

MR. KENDALL thought that the President of the Board of Trade had dealt unfairly with the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Frederic Smith), who stated distinctly that he did not wish to name any specific harbour on which that money should be expended. A Committee and a Royal Commission had reported on this subject; the House of Commons had voted in favour of harbours of refuge; hopes had been held out that something would be done; and what they asked the Government to do, was to do something in accordance with the recommendations that had been made.

MR. LIDDELL said, the House was placed in some difficulty with regard to the question before it. The hon. and gallant Member (Sir Frederic Smith) had not specified any particular harbour to which he wished money to be applied, but left it to the choice of the Government to select the harbours which should be assisted; and the Government absolutely refused to assist any harbour. This was a matter which had attracted public attention, so much so that a Committee, of which he (Mr. Liddell) was a Member, sat for three years; a Royal Commission had been appointed to inquire into the subject, and Parliament had discussed it over and over again. The claims of the coast with which he was connected had been repeatedly admitted. It was the most defenceless, both for purposes of war and trade, of any coast in the world. The loss of life and property was augmenting annually. The President of the Board of Trade had said that great efforts were made to save life; but he wanted to know how the Government aided those efforts, which were the result of the voluntary subscriptions from private individuals. [MR. MILNER GIBSON: We give a subsidy to lifeboats.] He was glad that the Government at last did something. But he wanted to call the attention of the House to this really national question. The Government had been for years apathetic on this subject. What was now asked for was, not that public money should be expended on any particular port, but for the benefit generally of the commerce of the world, in such places as the Government might consider best. He objected to a Minister of the Crown forcing figures on the attention of the House, because that was easily to be done in a case of this kind. If the money was not forthcoming let the question be deferred, because it was probably not a fitting time to bring it forward in an expiring Parliament; but it was the bounden duty of the Government to promise to do something.

SIR JOHN HAY thought the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had made a mistake in stating that the Government made a contribution towards lifeboats. There was one from the Mercantile Marine Fund, but he was not aware that any public money was voted by the House for that purpose. He quite agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Chatham, that it was the duty of the Government to do something to alleviate the dangers to which our shipping were exposed; and he must say that the conduct of the Government in this respect was not creditable to them. He had recently visited Harwich, and he found that the Government in getting rid of Felixstow Point had diverted the course of the tide to such an extent that it had narrowed the harbour from 400 yards to 100 yards, so that they had considerably damaged that harbour. It had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman that the Public Works Loan Commission could advance money for these improvements; but as one of the Commissioners, he (Sir John Hay) was able to state that at many of the places where harbours of refuge were required, there was no property upon which such loan could be satisfactorily granted, and those places were of the greatest importance to the commerce of this country. Take Filey, for instance, and there was no local property upon which they could grant loans. And yet it was of the utmost importance that contributions should be made in the very way that had been suggested by the Royal Commission. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the loss by gales on the eastern coast would be very little lessened if harbours of refuge existed; but he would venture to say that if there had been such harbours the vessels that had been wrecked on the coast of Holland would have been at anchor in the harbours and the losses would not have occurred.

SIR FREDERIC SMITH reminded the House that it was the Government and not the localities who first instituted this movement. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had stated that vessels would bear up for their own ports instead of going into harbours of refuge. No doubt they would do so if they could; but what he wanted was harbours of refuge for them when they could not bear up to their own ports.

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 99; Noes 111: Majority 12.

THEATRES, &c., BILL—[BILL 64.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. LOCKE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that such a measure had been rendered necessary in consequence of the action taken by the managers of certain theatres. Having obtained a monopoly, they wished to prevent all other persons who did not possess the Lord Chamberlain's licence from giving any stage performances which interfered with such licence. These powers were claimed under the 6 & 7 *Vict.* c. 61, called the Dramatic Licensing Act, which empowered the Lord Chamberlain to license theatres (not being patent theatres) in certain districts of the metropolis—namely, in London and Westminster, Finsbury, the Tower Hamlets, Southwark, Lambeth, and Marylebone. Theatres situate in other parts of the metropolis and the country generally were licensed by the magistrates—with the exception of certain places in which there were Royal residences, concerning which there was some dispute. Previous to the passing of this Act the patent theatres—Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and the Haymarket—possessed the exclusive right of performing the legitimate drama—although what that was it was difficult to discover, for, with the exception of Sadler's Wells and one or two other theatres, the performances were by no means legitimate. Besides the Dramatic Licensing Act, the 6 & 7 *Vict.* c. 61, there was the Act of the 25 *Geo.* II. c. 36, which was commonly called the Music and Dancing Act, and was passed to restrain persons from having public music or dancing on their premises without the licence of the magistrates granted at quarter sessions, the object being mainly to restrain what were called disorderly houses. By section 2 of that Act, the Justices in London and Westminster, or within twenty miles thereof, after the 1st of December, 1752, were empowered "to grant licences for public dancing, music, or other entertainments of the like kind."

Under that Act the minor theatres, as distinguished from Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and the Haymarket, were in the habit of playing what were called burlettas and melodramas, which were not prohibited under the 10 *Geo.* II. c. 28, the Act which established the licensing of plays by the Lord Chamberlain as at the time of the passing of that Act, this description of performances was unknown, the words in that Act were "any interlude tradegy, comedy, opera, play, farce, or other entertainments of the stage, or any part or parts therein." It was also the custom to keep the piano going, so as to bring the performance within the 25 *Geo.* II. c. 36. It was, however, decided by the cases of Rex *v.* Neville, 1 B and Ad. 489, in the year 1830, and Levy *v.* Jales, 8 A & E 129, that the licence for music and dancing did not authorise the acting of plays, and the Victoria Theatre was held not to be a licensed theatre. This being the state of things in 1831-2 a Select Committee of that House was appointed to consider the subject of dramatic literature. The Committee came to the conclusion that the trade in theatres ought to be thrown open, that the peculiar privileges of the three principal theatres should be done away with, and that all the theatres ought to have the power of performing any plays they thought proper. The Report of this Committee gave rise to the present Dramatic Licensing Act, under which Act the term "stage plays" was taken to include "every tragedy, comedy, farce, burletta, interlude, melodrama, pantomime, or other entertainment of the stage, or any part thereof." The words burletta, melodrama, and pantomime, being for the first time introduced into the definition of "stage play." What was the course which the grasping managers of these theatres had taken on the present occasion? A ballet had been performed at the Alhambra and other places. The managers of the theatres laid an information against Mr. Strange, the proprietor of the Alhambra. The case came before Mr. Tyrwhitt, at the Marylebone Police Court, and he decided that the performance was within the Act of Parliament. Mr. Strange appealed to the Middlesex magistrates, and they quashed the conviction. The theatrical managers were not satisfied, and Mr. Tyrwhitt had since granted a case for the opinion of the Queen's Bench. It was not only in London that a crusade had been commenced against the music-halls, for proceedings had been taken in Birmingham of a similar character. There was not a literary institution in the country, if these managers of theatres had their way, that would be permitted to perform a scene out of Shakespeare's plays or a portion of an opera. Under these circumstances the House was, he thought, called upon to interfere by legislation. The managers formerly complained that they had not the same privileges as the patent theatres; they then cried out for free trade; but they were now monopolists. They claimed to go further than the proprietors of the patent theatres, and wanted to have a monopoly of every species of stage performance. Such a state of things ought not to be permitted. The theatrical managers alleged that they were actuated by the desire to uphold the true drama—but, in fact, they hardly ever performed a piece that came within the definition of the legitimate drama. It was said that in some of those music-halls eating and drinking and smoking were allowed. Well, was the House aware that a licence to a theatre to perform stage plays carried with it a wine, beer, and spirit licence? This was in consequence of a clause having been introduced into an Act, the 5 & 6 *Will.* IV. c. 39, the 7th section of which Act authorized the Commissioners of Excise to grant retail licences to sell beer, spirits, and wine, in any theatre established under a royal patent, or licensed by the Lord Chamberlain, or by the Justices. Until the year 1858 this section of the Act had been considered as making it optional with the Excise to grant such licence, but a case was submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, and Sir FitzRoy Kelly gave it as his opinion that the Commissioners had no option whatever, and that the production of the Theatrical Licence entitled the holder of it to demand the licence to sell beer, wine, and spirits in the theatre as a matter of right. It appeared that there was no doubt that the opinion given by Sir FitzRoy Kelly, was a correct opinion, at all events it had been acted upon ever since, and it was the custom for the officers of Excise to bring the beer, spirits, and wine licences to every new lessee of a theatre as a matter of course, and receive payment for them. He (Mr. Locke) had endeavoured, when the Refreshment House Licences Bill was in Committee, to introduce a clause repealing the 7th section of the 5 & 6 *Will.* IV. c. 39, but he was met with the objection that such a clause was not germane to the subject of the Bill then before the House. This Bill provided that although the licence to be obtained under the 25 *Geo.* II. c. 36, should extend to the public performance of stage plays, still that licence should not, any more than it did at present, authorize the sale of beer, wine, or spirits, and that the 7th section of the 5 & 6 *Will.* IV. c. 39, should not apply to any place so licensed. In many theatres there was a beer-engine in the pit, gin and cordials were sold there, and so in the gallery and at the back of the boxes; but the managers were not content with this, for between the acts cans of beer were carried through the theatre, greatly interfering with the knees and backs of the audience. Was it not better to sit in a chair before a little table and drink your sherbet or what not? But then, forsooth, the theatre managers said, "Oh, you degrade the drama by allowing its performance in these music-halls!" After what he had told the House about the sale of liquor in theatres, he thought they would not be of opinion that the dignity of the drama had much to do with the question. And now what had been the decisions upon the music-hall performances? In the Birmingham case there was what appeared to be dancing and talking upon the stage; but, in point of fact, nobody was on the stage at all, the figures of the actors being reflected on the stage from a looking-glass placed out of sight of the audience. The manager thought he was safe, but the case was brought before the Common Pleas, which held that, under the Dramatic Licences Act, this was a stage performance. In the case of the Canterbury Hall performance, which he invited hon. Members to go and see, shadows were also thrown upon the stage, and Mr. Norton went to Canterbury Hall, and having seen the performances said that, though very unwillingly, he was obliged to give judgment against the proprietor, expressing his opinion, at the same time, that it was an admirable one, and was more amusing than most of the performances he saw at the theatre. For his own part he could not understand how the reflection of a person dancing seen in a mirror was anything improper so long as that person was decently garbed. Why should the stage be the only place where there was not free trade? No less a sum than £1,667,000 had been spent in building and fitting the London concert halls, music-halls, and entertainment galleries. These places would accommodate 179,000 people, and he believed that they were conducted with the greatest propriety. The number of theatres in London was twenty-three; the number of these places of entertainment forty-five. Stated shortly, the object of the Bill was to legalize the performance of stage plays at any place for which the magistrates' music and dancing licence had been obtained. But if the House thought that the performance of every species of stage plays ought not to be sanctioned at any but licensed theatres, could there be any objection to the music-halls having the same privilege which the minor theatres possessed before the monopoly was broken up—namely, the performance of burlettas, interludes, and melodramas? It must be remembered that the Lord Chamberlain's surveillance would still apply to the performance at these places, as the Bill reserved to the Lord Chamberlain the licensing of the plays performed; and he proposed certain provisions to insure the safety of the audience. He regretted that at that late hour (five minutes past one o'clock) he had not the opportunity of explaining the provisions of the Bill as he should desire to do. Although he could scarcely expect that the measure would become law this Session, he hoped the House, by reading it a second time, would affirm the principle that alterations ought to take place in the present system, and that the unseemly struggles which now took place between managers ought no longer to continue.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Locke.*)

MR. NEWDEGATE said, it was evident from the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman the subject was a very wide one. He therefore moved the adjournment of the debate.

Amendment proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."

SIR GEORGE GREY said, if his hon. and learned Friend meant to press the Bill, it was quite necessary that the debate should be adjourned. Considering the very late hour to which the House had sat that morning, that there had since been both a day and an evening sitting, and that the House would again assemble a few hours hence, he should not attempt to enter upon a discussion of the details of the measure. He suggested for the consideration of his hon. and learned Friend whether, having called attention to defects existing in the present law, it would not be well to withdraw the Bill for the present, and re-introduce it in a new Parliament, where his hon. and learned Friend, he hoped, would find a place. In the state of public business, an adjournment, moreover, really implied a relinquishment of the Bill for the present Session.

Mr. H. BERKELEY believed that if this Bill became law it would have the effect of turning every pothouse into a theatre, and every theatre into a pothouse.

Mr. BRADY also thought the passing of the Bill would reduce the drama to the lowest pitch it had ever stood at in the country.

Mr. LOCKE said, he was not disposed to accept mere assertions as an answer to his arguments. As for the comment of the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Berkeley), he had heard it before; it was not original, and he knew where it came from. Being anxious that the subject should be fully discussed, he would not oppose the Motion for adjournment.

Question, "That the debate be now adjourned," put and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 165.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. KINNAIRD suggested that this Order should be discharged. The Bill was one of 140 clauses, and there was not the least likelihood of its passing this Session.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, they never could pass any Bill unless they tried to do so. It was only fair towards the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), who had taken such pains with this important measure, that the Government should afford him all the assistance in their power.

Committee *deferred* till *Thursday.*

EXPIRING LAWS.

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire what temporary Laws of a public and general nature are now in force, and what Laws of the like nature have expired since the last Report on the subject; and also what Laws of the like nature are about to expire at particular periods or in consequence of any contingent public event, and to report the same, with their Observations thereupon, to the House:—Mr. Peel, Mr. Dodson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Cowper, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel French, Mr. Baring, Mr. Brand, Mr. Dunlop, and Lord John Manners:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Peel.*)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPPLEMENTAL (NO. 5) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the districts of Nottingham, Rusholme, Plymouth, Redcar, Cardiff, Kingston-upon-Hull, Guildford, Ramsgate, Ryde, Workington, and Oxford; and for other purposes relative to certain districts under the said Act, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 209.]

PIER AND HARBOUR ORDERS CONFIRMATION.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under "The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861," relating to Girvan, Mevagissey, and Stornoway.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson, and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 210.]

ULSTER CANAL TRANSFER BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Peel, Bill for transferring the Ulster Canal to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Mr. Luke White.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 211.]

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved,* That towards providing a further sum for defraying the expenses of the construction of works for the defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, and for the creation of a Central Arsenal, a sum not exceeding £650,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom; and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for such a term not exceeding thirty years; and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and payable out of the said Consolidated Fund.

2. *Resolved,* That the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorised to direct the payment to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £600, for the management of the contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

Sir George Grey

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 14, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Resolutions* [June 13] *reported* — Record of Title (Ireland) [Stamps]; Fortifications and Works.*

Ordered—Fortifications and Works;* Harbours Transfer.*

First Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [215]; Harbours Transfer* [216].

Second Reading — Tests Abolition (Oxford) [85]; Arrest for Debt Abolition (Ireland)* [126]; Pheasants (Ireland)* [193].

Committee—Penalties Law Amendment* [202].

Report — Penalties Law Amendment* [202]; Harwich Harbour* [137].

Third Reading—Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation* [195]; Colonial Laws Validity* [183]; Colonial Marriages Validity* [184]; Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c. Amendment* [196].

TESTS ABOLITION (OXFORD) BILL.

. [BILL 85.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. GOSCHEN:* Sir, two opposite criticisms have been passed upon the measure now before the House. Some have called it too small, and some have called it too large. It has been called too small by those who assumed that the privileges which, under the present Bill, are to be acquired by a Master of Arts without a theological test might, and probably would, be cut down in Committee, and not extended to the enjoyment of a share in the government of the University. It has been called too large by those who assumed that the privileges would be granted in their entirety. A measure which would confer the barren privilege of Master of Arts upon those candidates for that degree, who are not prepared to comply with existing regulations, was thought not to be worth the time and attention of this House. A measure which bestowed not a barren privilege, but a substantial privilege, a privilege carrying with itself all the rights which belong to the Master of Arts under the present system, was accused of tending to revolutionise the University and revolutionise the Church. I could not agree in either of those positions. Any progress made in the relaxation of tests and subscriptions—and I need hardly remind this House that by tests and subscriptions I mean not creeds, not formularies of faith, but forms of inquisition — any progress made in the relaxation of tests and subscriptions I consider to be most worthy of our time and attention; and if, on the other hand, all tests and subscriptions at the University were relaxed or abolished, I do not believe that the University would be revolutionised or the Church destroyed. If the dilemma is forced upon me, that the change we advocate is either small, and not worth making, or, if large, then dangerous, I will frankly accept the premise of the latter horn, while I repudiate the conclusion. The change, I admit, will be large and substantial. So far from being dangerous, it is in our eyes not only safe, but expedient, wise, and even necessary, in the interest of the University, in the interest of the country, and, I would venture to say, in the interests of the Church itself. Were I prepared to allow that the Bill admitted of being so cut down in Committee as to give a fresh legislative sanction to the exclusion of Dissenters from the most important privileges of an academical degree — for instance, if I were prepared to accept what is called the Cambridge compromise — I should indeed lay myself open to the criticism of having introduced for the second time a measure of no urgent importance. But after the Liberal party has decided once for all to accept the larger issue, and bestow the privileges of a degree without limitation, independently of a theological test—if we remember that the Bill was read a third time last year, and only lost in the final stage, after three divisions, by a majority of two in a full House—I am sure no one will be surprised if I say that I feel absolutely precluded from holding out any hope that limitations such as I have indicated could be admitted in Committee, at least with the consent of the friends of the Bill, or, I think I may say, of the great bulk of the Liberal party. The Bill must stand and fall upon the broader issue, whether the privileges can be bestowed in their entirety, if a degree is given at all. It was said last year that the principle of the Bill was to admit Dissenters to the governing body of the University. This I must take leave emphatically to deny. It is not the principle of the Bill, although unquestionably one of its results. The removal of the evils attending subscription is another result. What, then, it may be asked, is the principle of the Bill? The principle of the Bill is what the title indicates, and what the preamble expands — namely, the principle that academical degrees in the University of Oxford should for the future be independent of religious tests. Of course it is open to hon. Members to take exception to the principle of the Bill, or to take exception to the results of the Bill, or to oppose both the principle on its own account, and its results, direct and indirect. But let it not be said by hon. Members, as it was said last year, that under cover of a specious principle we are trying by underhand means to bring in larger results which we should be afraid to bring in nakedly. We contend for the principle for its own sake. We avow the results, and are prepared to defend them. Our position is—that our Universities, historically, for all general purposes, are national institutions, and legally, lay corporations. That their exclusive connection with the Church of England is, if I may use a technical term, "accidental, not essential." That our clergy merely happen to be educated there, as they are educated at our schools, for purposes of general training, before their own special studies begin. That theology is taught at Oxford, like history, or philosophy, simply as a part, and, it must be confessed, a very small part, of the general curriculum. That education, not professional, but general, and general in its widest sense, is in practice the education given at Oxford, looked for in Oxford, and I hope to be maintained in Oxford. That to this general education it is in the general interest of the country to attract the greatest possible number of Englishmen. That no class of Englishmen can, as a class, be attracted so long as they are placed under humiliating restrictions, or invited to occupy a position of legal, social, and academical inferiority. That any regulations which exclude from academical degrees, and all the privileges connected with these degrees, are a badge of that inferiority and that humiliation. That the imposition of religious tests falls under the head of such regulations, excluding those whom it is for the general good to include, humiliating those who ought to be attracted, and running counter to the national and unprofessional character of our Universities. This, Sir, is our position. These are the principles upon which the Bill is founded, leading to results by which we are prepared to stand. And, independently of the character of our Universities and their history, independently of law, independently of the expediency of making the area of the University co-extensive with the area of the nation; as a general principle, we contend that it is a solecism in science to connect academical degrees with compulsory professions of faith, and worse than a solecism in religion to secure a regulation orthodoxy by the temptation of secular rewards. I do not say that there is no other line of argument by which the present system may be effectually condemned. If I could even grant that the policy of exclusion were expedient and just, I should still call the present system, by which that policy is attempted to be carried out, a short-sighted system, an ineffectual system, an immoral system. And, unquestionably, it will be a great gain if, while we carry out the principle of making academical degrees independent of theological tests, we sweep away a system which, in its very application, independently of its objects, involves so great an amount of evil. But for the present I will confine myself to the arguments which I have stated.

I have said, Sir, that our Universities are lay corporations by the law of the land. And when I say this I am not speaking at random; indeed, I fear, that to some hon. Members I may seem to be simply stating a truism. It is, however, a truism so often forgotten that I may be excused if I insist upon it. The doctrine that our Universities are lay corporations is laid down as the established law in our text books. Stephen, in his *Commentaries*, speaking of lay corporations, divides them into civil and eleemosynary, and says that civil corporations are established for a variety of purposes, "and among these corporations," he tells us—

> "The general corporate bodies of Oxford and Cambridge must be ranked; for it is clear," he says, "that these corporations—namely, Oxford and Cambridge, are not spiritual or ecclesiastical, for they are composed of more laymen than clergy; neither are they eleemosynary foundations, though stipends are annexed to certain magistrates and professors, any more than other corporations where the acting officers have standing salaries, for these are rewards *pro opere et labore*, not charitable donations only, since every stipend is preceded by service and duty."

This applies, of course, to the Universities in their collective capacity. But even the colleges which might, without impairing the strength of my argument, be ecclesiastical foundations, this text-book of English Law asserts to be—

> "Lay, and not ecclesiastical, falling under the head of eleemosynary corporations founded for the promotion of piety and learning. All these eleemosynary corporations, though in some things partaking of the nature of ecclesiastical bodies, are, strictly speaking, lay, and not ecclesiastical, even though composed of ecclesiastical persons."

"The Popish Clergy," we are told, "did, it is true, consider them as Ecclesiastical corporations." But it is emphatically added—

> "Whatever might be formerly the opinion of the clergy, it is now held as established law, that colleges are lay corporations, though they may be totally composed of ecclesiastical persons."

Or if any hon. Members, learned in Ecclesiastical Law, should appeal to collateral evidence, and cite various ancient practices to prove the ecclesiastical character of the University—if, for instance, they wish to appeal to the right of visitation claimed by the Ordinary of the diocese—I would ask them whether they are not aware that the same evidence may be brought, and the existence of the same claims may be proved, in the case of many other institutions of which the warmest Anglican would not venture to assert that they are ecclesiastical corporations. Hospitals were under the same laws of visitation as Universities. They, as well as many other institutions, were under the control of the clergy, precisely in the same manner as the seats of learning, and that which is called, with suggestive vagueness, the connection of the Church with the University, is historically nothing more than the tie which bound the priesthood of the middle ages to the whole of the charitable, educational, and even professional institutions of the country.

It is thus, Sir, that I have ventured to assert that the Universities are not only legally but historically national institutions. The Universities were connected with the Church, not as a corporation, but simply with the priests as the depositaries of learning. The union between the Universities and the Church was not an intentional and historical alliance, for offence and defence, between secular education and ecclesiastical dominion. It arose simply and unintentionally, *ex necessitate rei*, from the fact that out of the priesthood secular knowledge was scarcely to be found. The Popish clergy were sufficiently usurping in their claim to supremacy over every department to which ecclesiastical influence could in any way be applied. But no rational advocate of Church influence in the present day ever ventures to assert that the sphere of clerical domination in present times should be coincident with the sphere occupied by the priests in old times. The exclusive connection of the University with the Church was, as I have said, a matter of accident—the result of the accidental fact that secular knowlege, professional knowledge, political knowledge, all practically lay concentrated in the hands of the clergy. It is true that the Catholic religion claimed the education of the people as one of its special functions. Could that claim have been granted, it would by no means follow that the Protestant successors of the Roman Catholic clergy might assert the same pretensions. The very essence of the Reformation was surely the emancipation of the lay intellect. But the curious feature is this — that while abroad the ultimate effect of the Reformation has been to secularise the Roman Catholic Universities, our Protestant Universities (Oxford will forgive me for using this offensive epithet) claim to maintain a character exclusively ecclesiastical. So little are the Roman Catholic Universities abroad afraid of admitting heretics, that I have been informed, and I confess I heard it with surprise, that—

> "No creed, or dogma, or confession of faith, has been imposed in any of the Roman Catholic Universities of Austria since 1782."

Take the University of Prague as an illustration. I hold in my hand a letter from a very excellent authority, who informs me that—

> "After the proclamation of the Patent of Tolerance (1781, by the Emperor Joseph II.) many of the formulas still then in use, by which the University was designated as exclusively Roman Catholic, were likewise abrogated. At the 'promotions' to doctorship (corresponding to our higher degrees) the profession of faith, till then used, was abolished. The Jews were admitted to the academical degrees."

Of Austria and Bavaria it may be said, without exaggeration, that they are far more Roman Catholic than England is Anglican, and yet only a short time ago the Rector of the University of Munich —an office corresponding partly to the Vice Chancellor and partly to the Master of a College in our Universities — was a Protestant. What do we find, then, to be the case? The Church of Rome, with her traditional hatred of the progress of human thought, with her confessed aversion to the pursuit of truth, and her avowed hostility to scientific inquiry, has been compelled to surrender to the State the keys of Continental Universities, where no theological tests bar the way to academical distinction, where degrees and emoluments are bestowed without enforced declarations of theological conformity; and the Church of England, placed in the midst of the most liberal country in the world, boasting its hold over the most enlightened portion of that country, claims, with the Church of Spain alone, the unenviable privilege of intolerant exclusion, the right to a monopoly over the academical education of the country, a monopoly, which in England excludes half the population from the traditional seats of the country's learning. Sir, I could almost imagine that many persons, both here and out of doors, may think that I am fighting with a shadow, when I so strenuously deny the ecclesiastical character of our Universities. But, strange as it may appear, if petitions are realities and not shadows, the ecclesiastical character of our Universities is held to be, not only a fact, but a fact for which the petitioners are prepared to sacrifice, I will not say their lives, I will not say their endowments, but unquestionably their reputation for charity and discretion. Here is what I may call the typical petition of the opponents of the Bill:—

> "Your Petitioners would represent to your honourable House that the University of Oxford is essentially (observe the word "*essentially*") essentially a University in connection with the Church of England, having been originally founded and subsequently endowed and maintained, and even at the present time is mainly supported by members of the Church of England."

"Mainly supported!" There is an unconscious candour about that word. And observe the contrast. It is stated broadly, without any qualification, or any such candid word as "mainly," that the University was originally founded and endowed by members of the Church of England. (Roman Catholic members, I presume.) According to this view, then, the University was exclusively maintained by the Church of England when the Church of England was Papist, and is only mainly supported by the Church of England now that the Church of England is Protestant. But let me just say here quite incidentally that, on the showing of these orthodox and candid petitioners it would be enough to answer, that as the University is mainly supported by members of the Church, justice will be satisfied if her academical degrees are mainly given to members of the Church; and that as they clearly contemplated a margin of support coming from other quarters, so a margin of academical degrees, with all their privileges, would be due, on their own showing, to the various quarters (whatever they may be) whence, according to the petitioners, that support is derived. But I lay no stress on this petition myself. Far from it. And I have only quoted it as a sample of the vague and even inconsistent character of the claims put forward. But the important point of the petition I have quoted is that it takes the bull by the horns, and bluntly declares that—

> "Tests are necessary for the protection of the ecclesiastical character of the University."

And this petition is the petition of the English Church Union. The clergy of the rural deanery of Bamburgh are a little more diplomatic, and the petitioners confine themselves to "feeling" that the Bill would "do injury to the distinctive Church character of the University." Well, this sounds a little better than the "ecclesiastical character" of the University. But I presume the sense and the drift are the same. The University is claimed as the exclusive property of one creed. The real truth, no doubt is, that in the early days of the University, its founders did not foresee the national diversities which have since arisen. The colleges were founded when the nation was of one belief, not for the benefit of one special creed independently of the nation. If diversities had not arisen, and all England were Anglican (or rather Roman Catholic, as it would be if no diversities had arisen), then a University which admitted only Catholics (or, if you prefer it, only Anglicans) would still be a national University. But the diversities have arisen. You have recognised them in this House. And it is a strong assumption to make, that because, when the Universities were founded, the nation and the Roman Catholic religion were co-extensive, now, when that co-extension no longer exists, a claim to the exclusive possession of the University can hold good, not in favour of the Roman Catholics, but in favour of their episcopalian successors. In this assumption there is a double fallacy—the fallacy that the Universities were founded for one creed, and the fallacy that the Church of England has now become the natural heir to the privileges granted to the favoured creed, although that creed is still alive. Nay, Sir, there is another fallacy, the fallacy of supposing that if the Anglican Church were in possession of such privileges, and the Roman Catholic Church, the original claimant, were defunct, the inheritance would have come to the Church of England through a natural law of succession, instead of through the action of the State. With the first of these fallacies I have already dealt. I, for my part, in common, I think, with the vast majority of this House and of the country, do not believe that the Universities ever were ecclesiastical "property," because I hold that they belong to the State. Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that they did not belong to the State, and belonged originally to the Roman Catholic Church, then we come to the second fallacy, that the Church of England is the natural heir to Roman Catholic foundations. But, Sir, let me ask, is the Roman Catholic Church extinct? Can the Church of England inherit from a Church which still lives amongst us? And especially I ask, how comes it that, under this theory, the Roman Catholics are at this moment excluded from the foundations which were created out of the funds of their co-religionists? How came the Church of England, if it ever came, by their property? By natural descent, or by a transfer made by the State? I am well aware of the ingenious theory which loves to represent the present State Church of England as the original Church of the land, and the Roman Catholics as a species of Dissenters. Could this theory be admitted we should only come to the awkward fact that the Universities were founded by those very Dissenters. But if the Roman Catholics in England had died out, how could the Church of England claim to be their heir? Surely the endowments would escheat to the State. We, Sir, are in no such difficulty. We maintain that the Universities necessarily belong to the State. The State assumed the right to deal with the Universities at the time of the Reformation, ousted the Roman Catholics, closed the gates upon those who had been their founders, barred them with theological tests, and to this day excludes the very men who, if any man ever had, would have the only semblance of a title derived from history and law.

I cannot conceal from myself, Sir, that the arguments which I have answered hitherto would only be important if I had left them unanswered. The strongest arguments are those which rely on the connection between the Church and the State. The State, it will be said, has founded a State Church, and handed over the State Universities to that State Church. Our answer is simple—What the State transferred for the good of the country once, the State, on your own admission, can transfer again for the good of the country. But we ask for no transfer. What we ask for is a simple extension, an extension which will not impair, nay, we honestly and firmly believe, will enhance the welfare of the Church, while it benefits the country at large. To this our opponents reply, No, the State may have given the State Universities to the State Church, but what the State has given it cannot take away. The Church has a claim to those Universities. This claim, strong as it may appear at first sight, again rests on a double fallacy. It is assumed, in the first place, that the Church has a monopoly of the education of the country. That is a claim which has never been allowed in this House. The Church might as well set up a claim to a monopoly of Parliament itself, as set up a claim to a monopoly of the national education. But it is assumed, in the second place, that education, in the limited sense in which the word is applicable to school training, is the sole function of the University. Sir, I cannot agree in this view. Education, properly so called, is only a part of University life. Another, and even a higher function of a University, properly so called, is the pursuit of truth. It has been said, on very high authority, from which, however, I beg respectfully to dissent, that free inquiry can only be conducted by free inquirers, and that, accordingly, such free inquiry cannot be loyally conducted in the Church. But, Sir, if this were true, which it is not, would it not prove conclusively that there can be no exclusive connection between the Church and the University? For if free inquiry cannot be conducted in the Church, where is it to be conducted? Why, of course, in our Universities. To our Universities we must look, not only for the education of our youth, but for the unimpeded pursuit of free inquiry. If, then, it were truly contended that free inquiry cannot loyally be conducted in the Church, whereas it is evidently an organic function of the University, this argument alone would effectually disprove the essential connection between the University and the Church.

I have attempted, Sir, to dispose of the essential connection between the Church and the University. A connection no doubt exists, but not an essential connection, not an exclusive connection. The next argument, however, which is put forward is that the Universities belong to the Church of England, because the clergy of the Church of England are educated there. The Universities, it is said, are the training schools of the English clergy. To this I reply, in similar terms, that although the clergy of the Church of England happen to be educated there, and I trust will long continue to be educated there, no essential and no exclusive connection exists between the clerical profession and the Universities, any more than between the Universities and other liberal professions. To represent Oxford as a clerical seminary is to rob Oxford of its title to be a University at all. It is, indeed, true enough, or it was until lately true enough, that the majority of those who take holy orders were educated at Oxford and Cambridge. But what was the education they received there? Why, Sir, the common education of every English gentleman, and the honours and distinctions, which were the best passports to the Church, were also the best passports to the bar. A small class of men, it is true, may wish to give a more professional and one-sided educacation to our clergy, but the country at large, I am sure, recognises the immense advantage of educating laity and clergy together, and developing rather a lay element in the clergy than a clerical element in onr laity. And here I may say that strange and inconsistent views are no doubt very frequently put forth by the champions of the clerical character of the Universities. On the one hand, to hear them speak, one might almost suppose that the laity were admitted to the Universities on sufferance, and that it is a high privilege to be allowed, as a simple layman, present and future, to associate with sucking curates *in posse*. To the fact of this association they point as the main safeguard for our future piety and principles. On the other hand, still under the hallucination that the Universities are the monopoly of the Church, they degrade them in their theory to a place where young curates are to sow their wild oats, and where the laity may be invited in, as the children of darkness, to supplement the learning, and lend a worldly grace to the children of light. Sir, I have no doubt whatever, that it is of infinitely greater advantage to the clergy to sow their wild oats among the laity than in a special theological locality devised for that purpose. But I would lay it down in the strongest terms that the education of the country is not to be sacrificed to the exigencies of the clergy, present or future. There are many arguments in connection with this subject which deserve to be treated with respect; but the argument that in legislating for Oxford we are simply to consider the education of our clergy is an argument which, stated in its naked form, no one of us would be prepared to admit. A fair share in that education in common with other professions the clergy may legitimately demand. They cannot demand to monopolise that education; they cannot even claim to render it less effectual to others, in order to render it more effectual to themselves. But some people may fear that the admission of Dissenters to the University might discourage the study of theology altogether. Those who entertain this fear evidently think that theology enters as a large part into University education. But I may confidently appeal to those who are at all conversant either with the studies or the life at Oxford whether, as a matter of fact, from the practical and common-sense point of view, theology enters as an important element into University training at all. I well remember the theological studies to which undergraduates were subjected as a matter of form. One hour a week was cut off from our secular studies for a lecture on the Thirty-nine Articles; and in the college to which I had the privilege to belong we had the further advantage of being called upon every week for an abstract of a University sermon. It was a current libel in the town that a pastrycook furnished these abstracts at a few shillings apiece. I do not wish to deny that at all times there are to be found at Oxford men who devote themselves zealously to ecclesiastical learning. There is scarcely any branch of science that has not some enthusiastic votaries at Oxford. But I repeat that, as a matter of practical experience, every one must admit that theology, to the great body of Oxford men who seek an academical degree, is but a part, and a very small part, of the studies prescribed, and a still smaller part of the actual studies undertaken. The education which is given, that which ought to be given, at Oxford, and given to clergy and laity alike, is a general education. And we have to ask whether it is wise, expedient, or just, to connect this general education and its legitimate rewards, not indeed with religion and that piety which, together with learning, appears in the phraseology of so many University grants, but with the enforced acceptance of dogmatic formulas not contemplated in those grants, and the enforced assent to hundreds of propositions, which no two men interpret alike, much less understand alike, and which, so far from having promoted that unity and spirit of concord which we are conjured in every tone of entreaty not to disturb, have been a source of more virulence, more bitterness, more malignity, than any one of those poor secular subjects, the study of which we are told would be demoralised if withdrawn from the hallowing influence of enforced theological unanimity.

But, independently of the wisdom and expediency, as an abstract question of policy, of connecting academical degrees with theological tests, the House is bound to consider, whether, if we believe the general education given at Oxford to be of such infinite importance, and to have conferred such inestimable benefits upon those who have been admitted there hitherto, whether, I say, in the interest of the country, we should not desire, nay, insist, that the full privileges of that general education should be extended beyond the area of the Church to the nation at large. It is the boast, Sir, and privilege of our Universities to give the highest and most general education of which this country is capable. Oxford aspires to give a certain tone and character to the intellect and feeling of the nation, and the establishment of her middle-class examinations, and the success which has attended them, show a growing bond of sympathy between herself and the country. There was a time when a gulf seemed to lie between academical education and the practical self-culture of the country. Oxford looked upon the unprivileged with arrogance, and the unprivileged looked upon Oxford with suspicion. I regret to say that this separation is a matter almost of congratulation to many friends of the University. I met with a curious proof of this the other day, and one I think well worth the attention of the House. An Oxford friend said to me, "So you are going to make a manufacturing college of Oxford." I asked him "How?" "Why, of course," he said, "by the abolition of tests." I think, Sir, this candid friend of mine has let the cat out of the bag. Theological tests are, you observe valued as Social tests. Whether this curious theory is founded on the assumption that country gentlemen and other classes, whoever they may be, who are not manufacturers, can digest tests which a manufacturer cannot even swallow, or whether there is a vague idea in the minds of Oxford men, that manufacturers are all Dissenters, I cannot tell. Probably my friend never thought about the matter. But his remark conveys the general idea of social exclusiveness which underlies the cloak of theological tenderness. It is not too much to say that the exclusiveness of the University, more than any other circumstance perhaps, has imperilled the cause of classical learning in this country, that cause which next to clerical ascendancy over the national intellect, lies nearest to the heart of the Conservative party. And, sympathising as I do, with classical education, I lament that ecclesiastical usurpation and theological intolerance should seriously have endangered the popularity of a system which, I may confidently say, is quite as dear to me as it is to them. It is a deplorable coincidence that classical and clerical, when applied to education, should, in the mind of half the country, have come to be considered as convertible terms. This, Sir, is the true historical key to the aversion in this country of the Dissenters to a classical education. The utilitarian view is little more than a pretext. And if that utilitarian view in matters of education is to be successfully combated, you must separate academical degrees from theological prejudices, and hold them out as the highest prizes and patents of refinement to the nation at large. If the Universities are really thrown open, if they are freely recognised as national institutions, if they are made to feel responsible for the education of the country at large, if they recognise the duty of supplying candidates, not only for the Bar and the Church, but for every department of national life, the Universities will not have been lowered in character, their tone will not have become, as hon. Members are not ashamed to insinuate, more vulgar, but they will have established a fresher and a surer hold, not only upon the intellect, but upon the affections and reverence of the nation. Surely, Sir, Churchmen least of all can deny that it would be of immense advantage to the Dissenters themselves to be admitted to the University. But probably they will continue to assert that it involves danger to the Church. Now, if there is one line of argument which is, if I may use the term, irritating to liberal Churchmen, it is the constant assumption which underlies the views of hon. Members opposite — namely, that not only in every intellectual conflict, but even in all friendly intellectual intercourse, our Church must certainly succumb to every other creed. Pushing its missionary labours abroad into every quarter with almost indiscreet energy, it pretends at home to shrink from all contact with other denominations. Dissenters and Catholics, if admitted to Oxford, would, it is feared, leaven the mass of orthodox Churchmen instead of being leavened by them. I am sure hon. Members will forgive me if I have no great confidence in the candour of that argument. A want of courage is the last charge that I feel I could bring against the great Oxford party who resist the abolition of tests and subscriptions. I think it is rather aversion than fear on which the policy of exclusion rests. And, indeed, it appears to me merely idle to suppose that if this Bill were to pass there would be such a rush of heretics into Oxford as to swamp its Anglican element. Under what circumstances, and how could that element be swamped? Intellectually or numerically? The first alternative I, as a Churchman, cannot for a moment admit, nor can I see how any Churchman can admit it. The second alternative runs exactly parallel with the admission of Jews and Dissenters to this House. Have the Jews and Dissenters in this House swamped every other element? Are they likely to swamp it? And on what conceivable principle would they swamp the University? Both in Oxford, and in this House, they will obtain that influence, and that influence only, which, as citizens of this country, they would in free competition for power and position naturally secure, were they not unequally weighted by the arbitrary legislation which the Bill before us is intended to remove. Sir, the argument of swamping the Universities does not deserve one moment's consideration. It is not only improbable, but, I venture to say, impossible, at all events only possible if the intellectual supremacy of the Church and her own predominance at Oxford were lost by her own default. I know it is said, "Let Dissenters come to the Universities, but do not admit them to the governing body of the University."

Sir, a very great fuss is made about admitting Dissenters to the government of the University. I say we have admitted them. We have admitted Jews, Catholics, Dissenters, to Parliament. Here they are, sitting and legislating for the University at this moment—legislating with infinitely greater effect, than if they themselves in cap and gown were sitting in Convocation, making speeches in Latin. Is it not perfectly clear that they are infinitely more powerful here, legislating for a University from which they are excluded, and if they

Mr. Goschen

were engaged in local legislation within the pale of a University in which they were included. There, as here, they would be in a minority—probably in a much smaller, certainly in a much less bitter, minority—in proportion as Oxford softened and disarmed by admission those whom now she professes to fear.

And now, Sir, I may ask—if there is any force in the arguments which I have urged, if there is any truth in the assertion that it is in the interest of the country to attract the greatest possible variety of Englishmen to the University—can we expect to attain this desirable consummation so long as whole classes are subjected to humiliating restrictions and distinctions? It is all very well to say that you are willing to educate them, willing to admit them on sufferance, willing to allow them to trespass within the sacred precincts of a clerical University. You know very well that they will not come in the character of interlopers to "sit below the salt." Call it sentimental, call it by whatever name you please, the fact remains. To be excluded from academical degrees is a penalty, a penalty on nonconformity staring the Nonconformist in the face from the first instant when he enters the University. Nor are Dissenters alone liable to fall under the weight of this penalty. Everyone who in the pursuit of truth stumbles on an unexpected difficulty, or whose theological studies, studies theoretically encouraged at Oxford, have awakened instead of blunting his conscience, may at any moment see the blank wall of theological uniformity barring his progress to academical distinction. Probably half the men who are excluded by theological tests are the very men who would most value and most be benefited by an academical degree. There are men to whom to be a graduate of Oxford means only to write M.A. after their names, and to be canvassed at a University election. There are numbers of others to whom to be a Master of Arts at Oxford conveys more substantial and nobler advantages. What they value is the acquisition of a position in the University itself. But to remain permanently at Oxford, and to take part in that Oxford life which begins, strictly speaking, after the career of the undergraduate is past, it is necessary either to proceed to the higher academical degree, or to incur that odium of nonconformity or eccentricity so often fatal to later prospects no less than to present comfort. I know a case in point at this moment. A Scotch Presbyterian, highly distinguished in Oxford examinations, who as a Bachelor of Arts has been most useful to his college, must, by the rules of that college, proceed to the higher degree of Master of Arts. He holds a fellowship now, but this fellowship must be vacated, and his position in the University be abandoned, if he does not sign the Thirty-nine Articles and the 36th Canon, now, after being a fellow of his college for several years. I ask the House, is this a grievance, or is it not? And is it a grievance to that individual only, and not rather to that important section of the country to which he belongs? Sir, I cannot understand how the grievance can be denied. I cannot understand how it can be said that the effect of the Bill before the House consists simply in the removal of a sentimental difficulty. But if, Sir, I were even to admit that the difficulty is purely sentimental, let me ask, what is it that is chiefly encouraged at Oxford? Is it not the sentiment of honour, and the feeling of a gentleman? Only the other day, in an admirable pamphlet upon this subject, I saw it stated that an Anglican paper, in concluding the notice of a book written by a Dissenter, said, "It was a great pity that no Dissenter could write like a gentleman." I call it a national outrage upon Dissenters, first to exclude them from the Universities, and then to flout them for not having that style and manner which hon. Members opposite boast are only to be acquired there. If the Bill before us did no more than remove such a grievance, it would amply repay the attention of the House. But it does more; and here, as some misapprehension exists as to the precise effect and scope of the Bill, I will ask leave to state distinctly what it proposes to do. It will allow every degree which is given at Oxford except theological degrees, to be taken without subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the 36th Canon. And these degrees will not be mere complimentary distinctions. That hon. Members opposite would have no objection to grant. They will carry with them votes in Convocation, which is called the governing body of the University. A further effect will be, that certain other privileges and emoluments for the tenure of which a degree of M.A., involving, as it does, subscription, has hitherto constituted a qualification, will be entirely thrown open. Such is briefly the effect of the Bill. As for the subscription itself, hon. Members ought to know its exact nature. I assume that hon. Members, especially those who have been at the University, are minutely acquainted with each of the 600, some say 900 propositions, contained in the Thirty-nine Articles. But perhaps the 36th Canon may not be so familiar to them. I spoke to a distinguished Oxford graduate the other day, who actually did not know that he had signed it. Let me read this Canon. It contains three articles. The first contains the usual oath of supremacy. The second and third are as follows:—

> "ART. II. That the Book of Common Prayer and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the Form in the said Book prescribed, in public Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, and none other.
>
> "ART. III. That he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred sixty and two: and that he acknowledgeth all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God."

And what is this ratification? Are hon. Members acquainted with this ratification? I may say that it is not only a surprising document—it is an astounding document. I will only read a few lines. This ratification, which every graduate has signed as agreeable to the Word of God, runs thus—

> "RATIFICATION.—This Book of Articles, before rehearsed, is again approved and allowed to be holden and executed within the Realm by the assent and consent of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the Grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith," &c. &c.

So, then, it is agreeable to the Word of God that our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth was Queen of France. So much for the 36th Canon. Well, Sir, the Bill which I have the honour to introduce will abolish subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to this wonderful 36th Canon, as a qualification for all but clerical degrees, and grant the privileges involved in such degrees without theological tests. And these privileges are, besides the vote in Convocation, the right to open private halls under certain regulations, and the possibility of holding fellowships in colleges where the statutes require the fellows to proceed to higher degrees. The requirement that those who have been elected fellows, must proceed after a limited time to take higher degrees, exists in most of the colleges, and involving, as we have seen, subscription to the Articles and the 36th Canon, contrives, by a side wind, to introduce a theological element where the object avowed is clearly to give the necessary academical status. In some colleges fellowships are confined to members of the Church of England by express stipulations. But in the majority the lay fellows are only incidentally confined to the Church by the statute which requires them to proceed to the higher degrees. The number of fellowships involved is large. Let me read to the House the position of the fellowships in the different colleges—

College.	No. of Fellows.	Clerical Fellows.	Restrictions on Fellowships in favour of Church of England.
University.	12	6	Forbidden to maintain doctrines contrary to Church of England, on pain of forfeiture.
Balliol	11	4	Liable to be deprived for contumacious Nonconformity.
Merton ...	18	9 must take orders within five years.	No restriction, but Act of Uniformity is used.
Exeter......	15	All to take orders unles excused for certain services as tutors.	Must all proceed to higher degrees.
Oriel	18	5	Ditto.
Queen's ...	19	9	Ditto.
New Coll.	30	All seem to be required to take orders, but the College has power to grant exemptions.	Ditto.
Lincoln ...	12	Ditto within ten years, with power to grant exemptions.	Ditto (and must be members of the Church of England).
All Soul's...	30	All seem to be open	Ditto.
Magdalen..	30	20	All liable to be deprived for contumacious Nonconformity.
B. N. C. ...	15	Must take orders in ten years.	Ditto.
C. C. C. ...	20	11 „ „	Must proceed to higher degrees.
Ch. Ch. ...	28	19 „ „	Ditto.
Trinity ...	12	7 „ „	All liable to be deprived for contumacious Nonconformity.
Jesus	13	9 „ „	Ditto.
Wadham ...	14	Seems to be no limitation	Ditto.
Pembroke .	10	4 „ „	Forbidden to maintain doctrines contrary to Church of England, on pain of forfeiture.
Worcester .	15	10 „ „	Must proceed to higher degrees.
St. John's .	18	12 „ „	Ditto.
Total	340		

It will be seen that in one college, Merton, Nonconformists are excluded from fellowships by the Act of Uniformity alone. In others they are excluded by a distinct college statute requiring all fellows to be members of the Church of England. But in the majority they are only shut out by the side wind of a compulsory higher degree, clogged with subscriptions and tests. Practically, as matters stand now, if the present Bill were to become law, and present regulations should remain in force, some eighty fellowships out of 340 would be thrown open to the competition of Dissenters (not " handed over " to Dissenters, as the noble Lord the Member for Stamford would say), but at least be open to this competition, which is a very different affair. I admit that I fear this full result might not be obtained. No doubt, if the higher academical degrees are conferred without theological tests, most of the colleges may, if they choose, fall back upon the Act of Uniformity, which is now almost dormant, and require the declaration of conformity from their fellows, which they do not now require. But even this would be great progress as compared with the present system, inasmuch as the declaration of conformity is infinitely less stringent than the signing of the Thirty-nine Articles and 36th Canon, since mere conformity would retain numbers of men whom the Thirty-nine Articles keep out.

Sir, there is a proviso in the Bill which, in one case, seems to limit the privilege of a Master of Arts. I mean the clause by which, in the case of certain offices, hitherto exclusively tenable by members of the Church of England, the retention of a test is admitted. These offices are the masterships of certain grammar schools and other similar positions; and as the present Bill merely aims at dealing with the Universities, and does not aim at dealing with schools by a side wind, this proviso has been introduced leaving the abolition of tests and subscriptions without effect upon those offices. That is a battle to be fought fairly on its own merits. I will candidly admit that many of us would sooner have seen this proviso omitted—the more so as it is a fact, and a most important fact, that in many of the schools in question the qualification of an M.A. degree was imposed long before the M.A. degree was clogged with tests. The charter of Westminster School required the head Master to be a Master of Arts ten years before the Earl of Leicester had introduced subscription to the University, a distinct proof that what was originally sought was academical distinction and not academical orthodoxy. But at present we will waive that point. One change is certainly proposed, but proposed exclusively in the case of such offices—namely, the substitution of what has been considered the lighter test of a *bonâ fide* membership of the Church, in place of the intellectual torture and declaration of assent to an infinite number of intellectual propositions. There are many, however, in whose judgment I have great confidence, who believe the new test will exclude persons whom the old test did not exclude. This, Sir, I should infinitely regret. But I may remind them that the only offices affected are offices pointedly defined in the Bill as exclusively tenable by members of the Church, and for such offices surely a declaration of belonging *bonâ fide* to that Church is the lightest possible test. Still, in a Bill whose very object it is to be inclusive as far as possible, I should be very sorry to introduce any clause which would exclude any individual from rights or privileges to which, under the present system, he is admitted. And thus, if the test selected, and taken from the Cambridge Act, should not be generally acceptable, it is a question to be discussed in Committee what form should be introduced. I would again remind the House that all these observations apply only to offices, not fellowships, and to offices hitherto tenable only by members of the Church of England. The degree and the vote in convocation will be entirely free.

I have endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to be candid at least with both sides of the House. I have endeavoured neither to underrate nor overrate the effect of the Bill. It is far better, I think, that we should clearly understand each other, and raise the full issues broadly. And the issues are these. Are we, or are we not, to maintain a system by which the highest rewards of academical distinction, the prizes, the franchise, the emoluments of a national University, are confined, not only to those who are members of a Church which includes scarcely half the population, but to those alone, even in that Church, who are ready to accept purely and simply, willingly and *ex animo*, without question and without doubt, for the present and for the future, the most complicated expression of its most difficult tenets and the most absolute adhesion to its forms? Are we, or are we not, to maintain a system which aims at enforcing theological unanimity by tempting the consciences, appealing to the ambition, and even appealing to the pecuniary interests, of those for whose intellectual purity and devotion to truth the University, of all places, must be held responsible? The University did not invent these tests. They were thrust upon her by the State. The State deliberately invented them as a machinery to be avowedly applied by the dominant party for the purpose of punishing religious dissent with political inequality. Tests and subscriptions have become the Protestant substitute for the infallibility of the Pope. And of the two, let me tell the House boldly that the Protestant substitute is the more inquisitorial and the more despotic. For the Church of Rome only says, "You are bound to believe what I tell you," while in England the State Church not only imposes the same obligation, but requires a declaration of unfeigned acceptance of that obligation under direct temporal penalties. I must repeat, under direct temporal penalties. For is it not a direct temporal penalty to be branded as an academical pariah? Is it not a direct temporal penalty to be shut out from the University except on humiliating terms? Is it not a direct temporal penalty to have to weigh a fellowship for life, perhaps against one article on which the Privy Council and Convocation may be hopelessly at issue, or to balance a vote in the University with an expression in the Burial Service, against which a large portion of the clergy are at this moment protesting? It is not, Sir, by temporal penalties, such as these, that the supremacy of the Church is to be maintained. Nor do I believe that their removal would (if I may borrow eloquent words which we have heard through one of the most fortunate "accidents of history") lead to the "corruption of nations and fall of empires." For my part, I do not apprehend a destruction of the supremacy of the Church if it will but rest its defence on the truth of its Creed and its Articles, not on an assent to them extorted by force. Between a State Church and the general interests of the country, I, for one, see no necessary antagonism. A State Church may exist without trenching on the liberties, without oppressing the consciences, without offending the prejudices, without narrowing the advantages, of those portions of the community which the Church does not embrace. But, if without a numerical majority—in our case barely reaching or passing one-half of the population—without being able to pretend even to a hope of winning over the remainder within any period which a statesman has a right to take into account —if in such circumstance a church claims to veto legislation, which, but for a fancied infraction of its own rights, it would freely confess to be the interest of all—such a church stakes its supremacy and its future on a principle which this country would never accept.

Sir, the truest connection, the surest connection, between the University and the Church can never be severed by an Act of this House. It must rest on the intrinsic power of the Church—on the hold of the Church over the respect and the affection of the nation. And if the Universities, to which we look for the progress of education and the development of truth, remain bound to the Church, less by the legal tie of tests and subscriptions than by the bond of a common love of truth, and a common sympathy with the wants and character of the nation, we may hope to realise at Oxford, not doctrinal unanimity, not the unity of the letter in the bond of subjection, but rather the beautiful aspiration of that prayer in our liturgy, so inclusively liberal, so splendidly Catholic, which prays for the unity, not of the letter, but the spirit—the bond, not of subjection, but of peace. The hon. Member then moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GRANT DUFF, in seconding the Motion, said, it seems to me that this Bill deserves support—first, on account of the benefits which it will confer upon the Church; secondly, on account of the benefits which it will confer upon Dissenters; and thirdly, on account of the benefits which it will confer upon the University. I think it will benefit the Church, because nothing that can in any way contribute to making her understand that her true strength lies, not in her dogma, but in her action upon the nation, not in the infallibility of her creed, but in the purity of her life, can fail to benefit her. If we succeed in carrying our Bill, and if the Church finds out that all the prophecies of evil that are now made by her alarmist friends with regard to the relaxation of University subscription turn out to be vain, and that, ten years hence, her influence at Oxford is greater than ever, some few at least of those who honestly fear to relax clerical subscriptions may see that they may do so, not only without danger, but with every prospect of obtaining for the Church a greater hold over England than she has had at any time since the revival of learning. If the Anglican Church is to remain the national Church, even in the limited and imperfect sense in which it is now the national Church, much more if she is ever to try to become a really national Church, it must be by pledging her ministers to act together against what all Christians admit to be evil, not by pledging them to the many hundred separate propositions contained in the Thirty-nine Articles, in addition to the many hundred propositions, not always perhaps quite reconcilable with the other set, to be found in the Prayer Book. The Anglican Church, as we now see it, is built on a political compromise which is crumbling under its weight. If it is to be propped up, it must be by forcing under it a more reasonable kind of compromise, a compromise which takes greater account of the individual conscience. Secondly, I think that this Bill will be useful to the Dissenters, because it will do something towards giving them their just rights at our Universities, and it is always useful to men to obtain justice. I think it will be useful to them, because it will open to them opportunities of broader culture and a more extended knowledge of some sections of their fellow-countrymen than they have ever yet had. I cannot honestly say that I think it will be useful to the especial interests of any one of the sects into which English

Nonconformity is divided. The odds in favour of the Church are far too great at Oxford to give any form of dissent any chance whatever; and if the Church becomes wiser and wider, the odds in her favour will become greater still. Looking at the matter from a Protestant point of view, it seems to me that the authorities of Propaganda knew their own interest when they quashed the proposal for a Roman Catholic College at Oxford, although that proposal was supported by all the best and most cultivated adherents of the Roman Catholic Church in England. Here we have another illustration of the true saying that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. I do not think my hon. Friend was quite accurate in what he said about the Universities of Austria. It was not the Roman Catholic Church that opened these Universities of her own free will. It was the State that made her do so. Churches are not apt to make concessions; and neither the Church of Rome nor the Church of England have ever shown a disposition to surrender any privilege which they thought they could keep. I was glad that my hon. Friend explained so fully our reason for retaining the proviso. That is an important point, and cannot be made too clear. An impression prevailed, when the hon. Member for East Sussex first brought in his Bill, that the declaration of *bonâ fide* membership which he proposed would operate in the case of some few Nonconformists as a more stringent test than the old one; but this impression arose simply from the fact that people forgot that, before you can proceed to the Master of Arts degree at Oxford, you are now obliged to subscribe, not only the Thirty-nine Articles, but also the three Articles of the 36th Canon—the second of which commits the subscriber, in the most positive manner, at once to the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, and to the Episcopal form of Church government. We have therefore felt that, in retaining the precise words used by my hon. Friend the Member for East Sussex, we are conferring a very considerable benefit upon the liberal members of the Church of England, and doing a very great deal for all classes of Non conformists; though, of course, not so much as we would do for them if we felt sure we could persuade the House to abolish the present tests, without providing a mitigated substitute. Thirdly, and lastly, I think this Bill would be useful to the University, because it will be one step towards lifting it to a true conception of its dignity and its duty. The University of Oxford, which is now little better than an appendage of the Anglican Church, was great and famous long before the Anglican Church existed; and it is safe to prophesy that it will be great and famous long after the Elizabethan compromise, which is dignified by that lofty title, has either vanished or become so much altered that those who now called themselves its best friends will hardly recognise it. The University must learn that her duties are to the nation, and not any sect in the nation, however powerful and respectable. She must cease to pride herself on being the biggest theological seminary in England, and learn to be, what her splendid revenues and her enormous advantages of every kind would easily enable her to be —the foremost labourer in every field of thought, and the first seat of learning in Christendom.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

Lord ROBERT CECIL rose to move an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day three months. The hon. Member who had moved the second reading had dwelt a good deal upon the inferiority of the position in which Dissenters found themselves when taking their degree of M.A., and the conscience of the hon. Member appeared to be considerably affected by having had to give an opinion as to Queen Elizabeth's title to the Crown of France. He had no wish to put any burden on the hon. Member, and as the Committee which lately sat to inquire into the subject of subscriptions had arrived at results which were generally approved, and which the Government themselves had embodied in a Bill, he should be very glad to see the subscriptions laid down for the clergy generally extended to all candidates for all degrees in the University of Oxford. With regard to the degree of M.A. he would say the same. He had not the smallest objection to what was called "the Cambridge compromise"—that was to say that the literary dignity of M.A. should be given to every Dissenter who showed that he deserved it. The one prominent feature of the Bill to which he objected was that it would give over the Government of the University to the Dissenters. In dealing with this measure last year the great difficulty which the opponents of the measure had to encounter was to ascertain what was the precise object which its supporters wished to attain. One Gentleman tried to persuade the House that there was not the least intention of altering the relations between the University and the Church, and that all he wanted to do was to let in a chance Presbyterian or mathematical Wesleyan who might happen to be excluded under the present system. The Chancellor of the Exchequer went a little further, and gave the Gentleman sitting opposite him rather a severe lecture for the indiscriminate resistance which they offered to University reform. On the present occasion he trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find it more expedient to lecture Gentlemen sitting on his own side of the House. There were Gentlemen, again, who, to use their own phrase, "showed their hands" last year. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) would have been content to abolish tests altogether, and the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff) told them that the less the clergy had to do with the University the better for that great institution. [Mr. GRANT DUFF: Hear, hear!] With all these conflicting statements, the House had at that time great difficulty in ascertaining the principle upon which they were voting. But all these difficulties were removed in the present instance by the extremely laudable candour of the hon. Member for London (Mr. Goschen) who shrank from no logical consequences that the Bill might seem to involve. He told the House that he wished them to follow the example of the Universities of Germany, and especially the example of one University at the head of which was a Jew. [Mr. GOSCHEN: A Protestant.] Oh, a Protestant Jew, was it? The hon. Member boldly avowed that his object was to effect a severance between the University and the Church, to declare that the University had no special connection with the Church; and he went further, for he distinctly laid down that his principles involved the Colleges in the same category with the University. The hon. Member told them that the University was a lay corporation, that the Colleges were lay corporations, and having been founded by Roman Catholics that they ought now to belong to Dissenters. If, therefore, the Colleges were not specifically included within the present Bill, they might conclude, he presumed, that the omission was in deference to the policy of reform by instalments, rather than from any objection to throw them open to the professors of every religious creed. Looking at the matter from this point of view, he (Lord Robert Cecil) had felt puzzled as to the precise aspect in which the hon. Gentleman regarded the study of theology. He had taken great trouble to prove that the University was a lay and not a theological corporation, and he seemed to conclude that the teaching of any particular form of belief was inconsistent with the privileges of a lay corporation. He denounced the study of theology as something specially belonging to the clergy, and his view appeared to be that the teaching of any form of religious belief was a professional peculiarity. One of the arguments which the hon. Member used to induce the House to abandon the teaching of any special form of religious belief at the University was that we should thereby attract the Dissenters who would then become greater proficients in classical literature. Now, if the House of Commons were really of opinion that it was better to teach good classics than good religion, he acknowledged that the opponents of this Bill had no further case whatever. But, for his own part, he was unable to take the same view as the hon. Member of the proposed change. He did not look on religious teaching as a professional peculiarity. The parents of this country, moreover, had been accustomed to regard religious teaching as an indispensable portion of the education of their children, and they had never given the slightest encouragement to any form of education from which the element of religion was excluded. The hon. Gentleman said they ought to make the Universities national, and that to confine their teaching to one form of religious belief was to prevent them being national, because the nation was not all of one religious belief. If that argument were carried out strictly, it would involve this necessary consequence, that the governing body of the University should include Churchmen, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Separatists, Unitarians, Mormons, Quakers—and he might go on for half-an-hour enumerating all the various forms of religious belief into which the nation was split up. He did not think he should excite any controversy when he stated that the addition of persons representing a great variety of religious beliefs to the governing body of the University would practically amount to the teaching of no religion at all. It was held by a good many gentlemen whose opinion was worthy of respect that in the earlier branches of education the teaching of religion was so elementary in its character that a great many sects might be combined in one class without anything being taught contrary to the belief of any of them. Without inquiring how far that theory was true, it was evident that it did not apply to persons of maturer age, or to more advanced stages of religious teaching. It might be the dream of politicians, but any one who had given attention to the subject of religious teaching would know that it was a simple impossibility to teach the truths of religion to any number of pupils without entering upon matters which were controverted between the various religious sects. The consequence was that if all religious sects were represented in the governing body, and if all had an equal right to teach its religious doctrine, that teaching must be a compromise between them all, and there was no compromise which could be satisfactory except the abandonment of religious teaching altogether. The hon. Member's argument proceeded throughout upon the assumption that the question was one involving the privileges of the clergy, and that an attempt would be made to treat the Universities as ecclesiastical corporations. He had no intention of putting forward any such view. He did not appear as the advocate of any special rights or privileges of the clergy, but as the advocate of parents who had hitherto used this University as a place of education for their children. Nothing could be clearer than that religious teaching was a matter upon which parents laid great stress. They had no such dread of the clergy as haunted the minds of the hon. Member for the City of London and the hon. Member for the Elgin burghs; but intrusted their children to the teaching of the clergy in almost every stage. The first schools to which children were sent were not schools in possession of large endowments, but schools selected by clergymen, and almost invariably presided over by them. In the public schools the clergy again were the main teachers; and in the interval elapsing between the departure of youths from them and their entrance on an University career, in the great majority of instances, clergymen were selected for the task of directing their studies. Some years ago an experiment was made to see if parents were willing to confide their children to secular teachers. The London University was set up amid great jubilations, and there was a great belief that a new educational era was being inaugurated. But what had been the result? Had the London University obtained such a hold on the affections of the country that any great number of institutions had been established on its model. On the contrary, parents preferred to send their children to the educational institutions of whatever denomination they might belong to, showed no willingness to exchange the benefits of religious training for any educational advantages the University might have to offer. That which parents would not do was to send their children to institutions in which there was no religious teaching. And so, if by this measure they introduced into the governing body the element of dissent they must extirpate religious teaching from the University, and so deprive the clergy of that teaching which they had enjoyed for three centuries. Let it not be said, as the hon. Gentleman had told them, that religious teaching went for a small matter at the University. There was something beyond the direct teaching of religion. The House was aware that moral philosophy occupied a high place amid the matters taught at Oxford. This particular branch of study has probably more share than any other in forming that peculiar cast of mind recognized as belonging to the University of Oxford; yet those studies would have to be revolutionized if persons were brought into the governing body whose religious belief forbade them to suffer those studies to continue in their present form. These were the grounds upon which he opposed the Bill, and happily there was no doubt in the present instance as to its scope and objects. The hon. Gentleman was willing to stake the issue upon the widest interpretation of the principles which he advocated; he did not ask the House to pass a Bill, hoping that it would be attended with no particular consequences, nor did he suggest that persons would be unwilling to avail themselves of its provisions; the hon. Member was quite willing to join issue on the question whether persons differing from the Church of England should or should not form a considerable element in the governing body of the University. To that proposal he (Lord Robert Cecil) objected, because, by its adoption, they would be destroying the position which the University had so long enjoyed with the governing classes of this country;

they would be injuring the interests of the University in a manner which they could never repair; degrading it to a level with those German Universities where intellectual progress and intellectual eminence were combined to so frightful an extent with absolute destitution of religious belief; and because, in doing all this, they would be inflicting the severest blow, not only on our education and the intellectual progress in this country, but, what was of much greater importance, on the purity of its religious belief.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. DODSON said, he had listened with great pleasure to the speech of the noble Lord; because, as it was founded upon a total misapprehension of the nature of the Bill, when its provisions were satisfactorily explained he would, no doubt, feel it his duty to give the measure his support. The noble Lord asserted that the Bill handed over the government of the University to Dissenters, instead of the Church of England; that it would separate Church and State; and that it would put all religions in the same position at the University. He was at issue with the noble Lord on all these points. The Bill left the religious teaching in the University on the same footing as that on which it existed since the Restoration; it left untouched all the University statutes and qualifications as to Professors and teachers, and all the provisions of the Act of Uniformity as to Fellows and Tutors. It carried out the principle of the University Reform Act of 1854—namely, that every person was entitled to go to the University for education, irrespective of what might be his religious belief. But the Act of 1854 carried out that principle in an imperfect manner, and the object of this Bill was to carry it out more fully. Under the Bill the religious teaching of the University would continue to be the teaching of the Church of England; a test would be required from teachers, but not from those who went to the University to be taught. It placed the University in this respect on the same footing as the Church occupied towards the nation. A policeman was not stationed at the door of every Church to say, "You shall not enter here unless you promise beforehand to agree with every word of the Liturgy and every portion of the sermon." On the contrary, the clergyman would be only too glad at the presence of those who differed from the Church of England, hoping that they might hear something to change their views. The University, in point of fact, did station the policeman at the door to exact a pledge from all who entered. It was true that a modification to some extent had taken place; the absurdity of exacting a pledge upon entrance regarding the truth of all that the student was about to be taught had been removed in 1854. But the impediment was only pushed a little further back. It was now presented, not upon entrance, but when taking out the degree of M.A. Every man wishing to go to Oxford had notice that the test would hereafter be required of him, and was practically told—"however eminently you may become qualified, unless at the close of your academical career you find that you can agree with all that you will have been taught you shall be deprived of your just reward." That restriction was therefore almost as severe in operation as the one which was formerly imposed. Now, it was said by some of the opponents of the Bill, that they would have no objection to allow Dissenters to take the degree of A.M., but they could not admit them into the governing body. Well, but what was the constitution of the governing body? There were three bodies which regulated the University of Oxford—first, the Hebdomadal Council; secondly, the Congregation; and lastly, Convocation. Now, the Hebdomadal Council had the sole and exclusive power of initiating measures for the government of the University; Congregation might suggest amendments, but could not insist on their acceptance by the Hebdomadal Council. As to Convocation, all they could do was when a measure was proposed by the Hebdomadal Council and was approved of by the Congregation, either to accept it *in toto* or reject it *in toto.* The legislative powers of Convocation were therefore of the most limited character, and the entrance of a few Dissenters into that body could have no practical influence. The Bill before the House did not, however, introduce any new principle as to the government of the University. Dissenters might be, and some actually were, members of Convocation, the test being one expressive of their willingness to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the 36th canon, and not of *bonâ fide* membership of the Church of England. Being members of Convocation they were eligible to the Hebdomadal Council. Moreover, six members of the Hebdomadal Council were selected from the body of Professors, from many of whom no tests were required. So that under the existing law persons, differing from the tenets of the Church of England, might be and were, not only members of Convocation, but members even of that very exclusive body, the Hebdomadal Council. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford evidently forgot that this Bill was not concocted and framed within the last fortnight or three weeks, or month; but was the same measure that was introduced into the House last Session, mainly at the instance of Heads of Houses, fellows and students of the University of Oxford, who had petitioned in favour of the principle which it sought to enact. If the noble Lord were so afraid of the further admission of Nonconformists into the governing body, he had simply, in Committee on the Bill, to move the insertion of words rendering the test of *bonâ fide* membership of the Church of England the condition of a seat in the Hebdomadal Council for any Master of Arts. The noble Lord need not then be guilty of the cruelty of refusing to relieve Churchmen from subscription to those tests whilst he would allow Dissenters to take the degree of A.M., and to become members of Convocation, which, in fact, was little more than the electoral body of the University. The Bill was not one to benefit Dissenters as regarded the University so much as Churchmen, nor was it one to alter the religious teaching of that institution. The measure proposed no change whatever in the government of the University. He hoped that the noble Lord, who had evidently been misinformed on every one of the points on which his opposition was based, would devote the few minutes that would elapse between the present moment and the division in reading the Bill. If the noble Lord would but do that he (Mr. Dodson) would not despair of him admitting the totally erroneous view he had entertained of this Bill, and, as a consequence, of his withdrawing his Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, if my hon. Friend who has just sat down had been the mover of the Bill, and if, in moving it, he had pronounced the speech which he made last year or which he has just delivered, I should very gladly have followed him into the lobby; and that for reasons to which I will presently advert. But in a Bill of this kind very much depends upon the tone, the language, and the views of those by whom it is introduced. There is a very great difference of opinion in the House, and the practicability of carrying any measure of this kind, and therefore, to a great degree, the utility of entertaining the question at all, necessarily depends on the language and views of those who promote and support it. No Bill of this kind, however amended, can be carried, I apprehend, in opposition to the declared views of the Mover of the Bill. And we have heard the views of the Mover of the Bill, as well as those of my hon. Friend who has just sat down. Each hon. Gentleman has delivered a speech of great ability. But the latter hon. Gentleman does not stand precisely in the same position of authority which he occupied last year. The speech of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), like all his speeches, was also one of great ability, but it was impossible to mistake its *animus* and spirit. It went the whole length of declaring, if I understood it rightly, that the Church of England was entitled to take within the precincts of the University whatever advantages her own hold on the public opinion of the country might give her—and, in saying that, I know well the hold of the Church on the opinion of my hon. Friend, and the manner in which, in practice, he exhibits the sincerity of that hold; but his argument went to this extent, that the Church must depend on such numerical support as she could obtain, and on nothing else. My hon. Friend says that the Church has no title to an organic recognition in the constitution of the University. I am sorry I do not accompany him in the assertion of that principle. He states that the amount of theological instruction given to Undergraduates is very small. That amount appears to be greatly understated by my hon. Friend; and I think he was unfortunate, so far as my recollection goes, in the limited modicum of that valuable commodity that, according to his statement, was administered to him during the time he was an Undergraduate. But, Sir, whether it be great or small, this is not a question of theological instruction alone. It is true, as my hon. Friend says, that the object of the University is to give a general education; but the question is, can that education be separated from the spirit of a distinct and definite religion? It is not a question of mere lectures or book, but of that general education as it is understood in an English University, and as I trust it will be always understood, which consists in the formation of character, and the regulation and the government of life. Whether the precise and specific theological instruction given at the University be more limited or extended—whether it be desirable in the education of an English gentleman to carry it farther or less far—I am very glad that theological instruction is definitely recognised as a proper subject of University teaching. That, however, is by no means the whole question. The question is, whether the religion of the Church of England, or of some Church, and the recognition of that religion in the system of the University, is necessary in order to enable the University to perform its teaching work and to exercise its proper influence upon the character as a part of the discipline of life. This is not a mere question as between the clergy and laity—it is no question of conflict between the Church and State, but of the convictions commonly entertained by religious parents concerning the kind of education and training to which they desire to submit their children. In my opinion parents have the strongest feeling on the subject. There is no separation here analogous to that which divides this House. Nay, more; I go further and say there is no separation analogous to that which divides religious denominations, for the professors of the several religious creeds in this country are alike anxious for the instruction of their children in the specific tenets they profess. That is, therefore, really the nature of this question; and I must say, that as far as any authority of precedent can be drawn from the recent proceedings of Parliament applicable to this matter, I must say it is not favourable to the argument and the speech of my hon. Friend. And I am bound to say that I think it would be idle and delusive for me to vote for the Bill in the teeth of the argument of my hon. Friend. In 1860 Parliament passed with general assent an Act on the subject of endowed grammer schools—23 *Vict.* c. 11. That Act proceeded on three principles—first, on the principle that where, in the deeds of the founder, there was a specific condition that all the children should be educated in the belief of the founder, or in some particular religious belief, the Act should be inoperative, and the will of the founder should be observed. In the next place, where the founder did not give any specific instruction, the trustees were not only enabled, but required, to admit without religious distinctions all children to the benefits of the general instruction of the school, but without any interference with their religious education. Thirdly, Parliament, in thus fixing the religious basis of grammar schools with regard to the question of comprehension, or non-comprehension, advisedly refrained from interfering with the constitution of the governing body. Parliament, in 1860, thought fit to leave the governing body as it was, and where a school was appointed to be governed by members of the Church of England it so remains by the authority of Parliament. That authority of Parliament was given at no more remote date than five years ago. Now, if it were reasonable in the case of grammar schools that the specific denominational religious character of the governing body should be retained, is it less reasonable in the case of the University? If you examine the constituents of the class for whom the grammar schools were intended, you will find that a very large proportion—perhaps the majority—of those who avail themselves of these schools are Dissenters, for they form a much larger portion of the middle classes than those who repair to the University. When, then, you have a system of exclusion, that system must be more or less irrational and offensive in proportion as those in whose favour it is enacted comprise or do not comprise the bulk and mass of the community at large; and, therefore, if half, or nearly half, of those who go to the University were Dissenters, the maintenance of our exclusive system, however it might be right and sound in principle, would be more offensive than it is. The fact, however, cannot be disputed that an immense proportion of those who resort to the University are the children of Churchmen. A smaller proportion in the case of grammar schools are the children of Churchmen; yet, even in the case of the grammar schools, Parliament five years ago did not think fit to interfere with the constitution of the governing bodies, but left them with perfect justice in every case imprinted with whatever specific religious character the founder had given them. I confess for myself that, apart from all distinctions between Churchmen and Dissenters, I am convinced of the soundness and wisdom, under the circumstances of this country, of that which is called the denominational system. I mean that we should not endeavour to tamper with the features and principles either of the Established or any other religion. I would recognise the same sacredness against political invasion in the one case as in the other. To maintain a definite religious teaching is the principle on which we have proceeded in the whole of our recent and most important administrative and legislative Acts with regard to primary and popular education. And that is a principle to which I think we ought to adhere in our Universities as well as in our grammar schools. The noble Lord (Lord Robert Cecil) referred to me as having last year lectured the opponents of this Bill, and expressed a hope that I might this year lecture its friends. I feel some delicacy in referring to my own conduct on another occasion, but let us look at the facts as they occurred. My hon. Friend who last spoke (Mr. Dodson) says the Bill has two great objects—first, that the Dissenter who had passed through a University education shall have the reward of his labours in a degree; and secondly, that by that degree he should be admitted to the body termed the Convocation, the one vital function of which in the view of my hon. Friend is to return Members to this House. If these are indeed the two great objects of the Bill, in my opinion the ground of controversy is very much narrowed. What took place on the occasion on which I am said to have lectured the opponents of the Bill was this:—I did, under very strong convictions, express my great regret (for the first time for many years) that my hon. Friend and Colleague (Sir William Heathcote) should have moved the rejection of this Bill, because on that occasion the mover of the Bill had adverted to the possibility of the Bill being amended in Committee—which was language very different from that used to-day by the hon. Gentleman the Member for London. I am strongly of opinion that it is desirable to alter the basis of the law in regard to the University of Oxford on this subject. I think that the tests exacted from lay members of the Church of England at Oxford, and at Oxford alone, ought to be altered and modified, apart from the question of clerical subscription, and that the same principle should obtain there as elsewhere. Secondly, I am strongly of opinion that the regulations in question do not grant to Dissenters all that we may safely give them, still maintaining intact the principle that the government of the University and of the colleges should be so lodged in the Church of England as to give ample and adequate security for the religious instruction and discipline of the University. After that Bill was carried by a large majority I ventured to communicate with my hon. Friend and Colleague. I transmitted to him a copy of the Bill, amended and altered in such manner that it would, as I considered, have reserved the general government of the University and Colleges in the hands of the Church of England; and I may say, parenthetically, that this Bill does not enter so largely and directly into the question of government, but it is quite plain that it involves the principle. That Bill would have provided those objects, in the first place, by enabling persons not members of the Church of England, and without reference to any religious distinctions whatever, but who possessed the necessary academical distinctions, to have founded, governed, and conducted independent Halls in the University. And those acquainted with Oxford, and, still more, with Cambridge, know that there is no distinction of an essential character between the Halls and Colleges; that they are both independent educational institutions, and that these independent Halls might have grown into Colleges to all intents and purposes. The next effect of the Bill, as amended, was that persons taking lay degrees would have been relieved from taking religious tests. That which Parliament enacted in 1854 with respect to admission to bachelor degrees would also have referred to the higher degrees in the University not theological. The third effect of the Bill would have been that on admission to the governing body a test would have been applied—not that of the Thirty-nine Articles, but a general declaration of membership of the Church of England. Another provision would have given to the University itself, in the case of certain professorships, the power to dispense even with that test, but only in individual cases. Lastly, the Bill, as amended, gave the power of voting for Members of Parliament. Among these five objects were thus included the two described by my hon. Friend as the great objects of the Bill, although not admitted to be such by my hon. Friend the Mover of the second reading. I had ventured to complain of my hon. Friend and Colleague on the second reading of the Bill, but I had no reason to complain of the spirit in which he received these Amendments. He did not tie himself to every letter of the provisions of the amended Bill, but he gave for himself, and those whom he might be able to influence, a general acceptance of these Amendments, as a settlement of the question which it would be wise to adopt. The next step was to ascertain whether the promoters of the Bill would allow it to pass with these Amendments. Here the result was a total failure. We were given to understand by the promoters of the Bill that they could not support these Amendments, and it would not have been fair to my hon. Friend opposite to avail ourselves of his liberal and wise reply, and to commit him to these Amendments. Under these circumstances I am bound to say that I felt it to be my duty, as a member of the University of Oxford, to vote against the third reading. I had hoped that we might have had a more favourable prospect opened to us to-day. The changes I have recited would have been considerable and important changes. We have heard to-day of the grievance—I never felt it to be one myself—of calling upon laymen to sign the Thirty-nine Articles. If the repeal of that grievance had alone been offered it would have been wise to have accepted it. But if these changes, which would have been so considerable, and which, if liberally applied, would have given everything except the central direction of the governing body in this great seat of education, were not accepted, it would have been idle and delusive on my part to give a support to the second reading, which I must immediately proceed to qualify, to retract, and withdraw, by thrusting into the Bill in Committee important and essential modifications which my hon. Friend had avowed his determination never to accept.

Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE said, he felt bound substantially to confirm the statement just made by his right hon. Friend, but there was one important Amendment to which his right hon. Friend had not adverted and to which he (Sir William Heathcote) assented — namely, that teaching officers should be protected not by the declaration proposed in the Bill, but by a subscription such as might be eventually settled for the clergy. He had not entered into a consideration of the original Bill, nor into the amended Bill as suggested by his right hon. Friend, because he was contented with the state of things as they existed; but he had intimated to the hon. Gentleman his readiness to consider the Amendments when they should be proposed to the House with one exception with the existing state of things, and was not satisfied that the grievances were such as to render legislation desirable; but the question having been stirred he was quite ready to consider any amendments that might be proposed. One grievance that appeared to require redress was that a Roman Catholic or Dissenter could not at Oxford open a separate Hall for the education of his co-religionists, and he thought that a provision to that effect might be engrafted on the Bill. The Roman Catholics naturally required that their young men should receive a strictly religious education in their own Halls, and it would be hard to deny the justice of that demand. On the other hand he was not willing to concede that the managers of these Halls, having taken the necessary degree, should be introduced into the managing body of the University. On the present occasion the question appeared to have shifted its position. There was no practical object to be attained by voting for the Bill in its present stage and at the present period of the Session, except to tie the House to certain principles, without having the opportunity of modifying them hereafter. Unless there was a reasonable chance of passing such a measure, its promoters asked more than they ought to do from those who were not prepared to go to the whole length with them. Last year he was willing to receive this Bill in the spirit of peace; but he trusted that many hon. Members who were doubtful last year would now see that it was hopeless to proceed with this measure, and that the best thing to be done was to reject it at its present stage.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER wished, in explanation, to confirm the recollection of his hon. Friend that the question of a full and clerical subscription would have been reserved for all teaching offices.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said that both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the hon. Baronet (Sir William Heathcote), admitted that grievances existed in the University of Oxford, and were prepared to remove them. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought the time had come when the question might have been settled by a compromise, it was in his power to have settled it, and signalized a Session not otherwise remarkable for the measures passed. He knew he would have been supported by his hon. Colleague in the representation of the University, and by Gentlemen on both sides of the House, and would have been able to carry a Bill which he (Mr. W. E. Forster) granted would have been a substantial advantage. It was, therefore, hardly fair to throw on the Dissenters the burden of standing in the way of legislation, when it was in the power of the right hon. Gentleman himself to have settled the question at once. He wished to state why he (Mr. W. E. Forster) as an individual could not depart from the principle laid down by the hon. Member for the City of London. All the Members who had spoken hitherto were members of that great institution, the University of Oxford. He unfortunately was not; but he had listened to the debate with great interest, because if this measure had passed years ago probably he would have had the advantage which he never ceased to regret he had not had, of being a member of one of the Universities. He knew it was said they ought to be contented with what they had already got; but if they opened the Universities to Dissenters it must be done with open hand. Great as were the advantages of the Universities, they never would, and never ought to go to them until they were admitted on terms of perfect equality. The principle for which the hon. Member for the City of London contended was that the University of Oxford was not a denominational, but a national institution, and that no subject of the realm ought to be excluded from it. Now, he had listened attentively to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford, and he must be permitted to say that the noble Lord had never before in his hearing made so slight an attempt to meet the arguments he had to reply to, as on that occasion in answering the speech of the hon. Member for the City of London; but there was one omission on the part of the noble Lord which was to his mind conclusive. His hon. Friend the Member for the City of London contended that the University was not Church property, nor an ecclesiastical association, but a great national institution. This argument the noble Lord had passed over altogether, though if he had had any reasonable grounds for disputing that, he doubtless would have offered some reply. The country would now be able to consider the question without the prospect of the claim that the University was Church property being advanced again. He found no attempt to speak on behalf of tests being retained for members of the Church of England. He understood that was one of the grievances which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to remove, and the hon. Baronet opposite did not object to its removal. He rejoiced at that fact. He had some opportunity of knowing how these tests worked. Living in a district where there was a good deal of thought, he had been pained to find the extent to which the principles of truth were sapped amongst the earnest, sincere, hard-working, clear thinking men of the lower class, by the way in which they found the expounders of truth were compelled to reconcile to their consciences the tests they were obliged to take. He, therefore, rejoiced at the admission on both sides of the House that it was no longer necessary to subject the lay members of the Church to these tests. He now came to the principal objection taken by the noble Lord the Member for Stamford and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if they passed the Bill they would lose the religious teaching of the University — lose the denominational form of that teaching. But was there any member of the University of Oxford who did not think the description given by the hon. Member for the City of London of the amount of religious teaching given by the University, as an University, was not more correct than that insinuated rather than asserted by the noble Lord the Member for Stamford. He had tried to ascertain the amount of direct religious teaching given by the University, and found it very small. At Oxford a candidate was questioned upon the text of the Four Gospels and his general knowledge of the Old Testament history. On his final examination for the B.A. degree he was examined upon the text of the Thirty-nine Articles; and even this might be evaded by any one not professing to be a member of the Church of England if he would take one Greek and Latin author by way of compensation. Was this of the slightest use? Then it was said the Undergraduates had to attend the University sermons. The first Sunday he was at Oxford he went to hear the University sermon, expecting to see a large body of the University Under Graduates present. He found, however, that it was the fashion for the University Undergraduates, and those who taught them, not to attend these sermons. That was the whole amount of the religious teaching given by the University. That which was given by the Colleges was also wonderfully small, and no one could say that it was necessary to keep up the exclusion of these tests in order to maintain that amount of religious teaching. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had drawn a comparison between the Universities and grammar schools; but was anything like the same amount of discipline required in the one case as in the other? It would be a sad thing for England if a young man on leaving school and home had to go to the University to learn religion. But this Bill did not interfere with denominational teaching in the Colleges. The object of the present Bill was to make the University a national institution; but he acknowledged that the present Bill, good as it might be in itself, would still be incomplete without the addition of some such measure as had already been introduced by the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. E. P. Bouverie), in order to permit the Colleges to frame their own statutes. They might depend upon it that so long as the feeling of the Church of England was so strongly manifested in favour of what he must term denominational education, they would have a large portion of the Colleges declaring that all their teachers must belong to the Church of England. The hon. Baronet the Member for the University (Sir William Heathcote) said he would remove the bar which at present prevented Roman Catholics or Dissenters from creating halls or colleges of their own. In that case they would have a national University, with colleges purely Church of England, purely Roman Catholic and purely Dissenting. There was, indeed, another description of colleges which he should be glad also to see established —namely, colleges founded upon the principle that, while they so governed themselves as to exclude men of no religion at all, or whose moral character would not bear investigation, from acting therein as teachers, they would not insist upon their being all of one denomination, or even all holding one doctrine. He was convinced that if ever colleges could be established in the Universities of that free character they would exercise an immense influence over the education of the people of this country, because they would do much to meet what was termed the religious difficulty — that difficulty which at the present time operated in such a manner as to prevent a large class of persons from obtaining any education whatever, religious or secular. The denominational privileges which the Church now enjoyed were said to be one of its principal bulwarks; but the House would do well to remember that no bulwark could be of any advantage in the long run which was founded on injustice. What right had the supporters of any particular denomination to exclude from participation in the advantages of a national institution like the University other denominations? He could not but believe that there were other reasons which influenced the opponents of this measure than those which had been expressed in the House to-day. The noble Lord who had opposed the Bill (Lord Robert Cecil) had given one reason for his opposition. He stated that if this Bill were passed it would be necessary to give up the connection between the governing classes and the Church. But did the noble Lord really wish that Roman Catholics and Dissenters should be deprived of the advantages which were to be derived from the Universities in order to maintain the connection between the Church of England and the governing classes? The fact, however, was that at this moment the governing classes were not solely composed of Churchmen.

Lord ROBERT CECIL said, that the hon. Member had misunderstood him. He did not say a word about the governing bodies.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER understood what he had said to be the fair interpretation of the noble Lord's views, and he was glad of the opportunity being afforded him to retract the statement. He would only add that it was an error to imagine, from the line of politics he usually adopted, and because he was the son of a Nonconformist, that he entertained any hostility towards the Church of England. If they were starting afresh in a new country it was not likely that there would be any particular Church in direct connection with the Government, but he was glad to have the opportunity of acknowledging that the Established Church had been of the greatest utility to this country, and that utility had been no where more strongly manifested than in its connection with the parochial system, which indeed was a very essential part of it. It had in times past been of the greatest possible advantage to have in each parish educated clergymen. The parochial system was indeed the great merit of the Church of England, and it formed its strongest hold upon the affections of the people. It was not until that system was attacked in this House that the Church need fear. He would, however, ask Members on the opposite side of the House, and Members on that side of the House who regarded themselves as the especial defenders of the Church Establishment, to consider whether they were really defending it when they encumbered it with the useless injustice which he conceived to be involved in the effort to keep these noble institutions denominational and sectarian, instead of national, in their character, and imposing upon them a limitation which it should rather be their pride to see them freed from.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY congratulated the House that, from the candid and admirable speech made by the Mover of the Bill, they were in a position distinctly to understand what they were asked to discuss. The hon. Member for the City of London had distinctly laid down in his speech that the complete emancipation of Oxford from all Anglican tests was what he aimed at, and the hon. Member did not hesitate in stating his desire that men of every, or of no creed, should take part in matters connected with the University, if by their intellectual ability they had shown themselves fitted to exercise such power. Nothing, however, could, he (Mr. Hardy) conceived, be more disastrous, nor anything more contrary to the spirit in which the University should be maintained. He could not recognize in a University that which the hon. Member had put forward as one of its excellencies—a place where free inquiry was to have full scope. He, on the contrary, recognized in a University a place where, above all others, the teaching should be based upon definite principles and known truths, removed from out the pale of free inquiry; a place to which parents might send their sons for education at an age when they were capable of forming opinions, assured that the teaching and discipline they would receive were at least based upon religious truth—upon something definite and well known, and not upon a something which was yet the subject of inquiry. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) had challenged an answer to his assertion that the Universities were national institutions. No doubt the Universities of England were national institutions in the same sense that the Church of England was a national Church. All who pleased might come to learn in the Church or in the Universities; but those who teach, whether in the one or the other, were confined to definite truths and distinct theological principles. The hon. Member (Mr. Forster) had, he believed, most unjustly attributed the opposition to the Bill to an objection on the part of the opponents of the measure to the admission of the manufacturing interests. For his (Mr. Hardy's) own part, he was proud that he had been connected with the manufacturing interests of the country, and neither at school nor at college had he even found scholars judged by the occupation of their fathers. They were judged by their own merits, they formed their own friendships, without the slightest regard to whether they belonged to the land or to the manufactures. He had opposed this measure when it was brought forward on a former occasion by the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Dodson); and his opposition then arose not from the speech of the Mover, but from the objects contemplated by the Bill itself; and he was, therefore, as strongly opposed to the Bill of the hon. Member for London (Mr. Goschen). It was said that admission of Dissenters into Convocation was not really admission into the governing bodies, because the Hebdomadal Council might elect Professors who were not subject to these tests. This, however, he believed to be a mistake, because everything done with regard to changes in the University must be done by Convocation. At the time that Parliament reformed the municipal corporations, those bodies were deprived of the right of patronage in regard to Church livings, because it was deemed unsafe to intrust the gift of those livings to men who might be favourable to creeds opposed in point of doctrine to the Church of England. Convocation at present exercised a similar power; and yet they were asked to admit into that body men opposed, not only to the doctrines of the Anglican Church, but to any dogmatical teaching whatever. He was sorry to say that there were free inquirers willing even at the present moment to take such a position upon themselves. There were persons in the Church of England who were willing to take tests inconsistent with their creed. The religious teaching imparted at the University, which had been described by the hon. Member who had just sat down as comprised chiefly in a series of questions, in reality impregnated the whole system of University education. Was it at all unreasonable that they should require in an University which was founded by religious persons for the purposes of religious teaching that any one taking the degree of M.A., which conferred no more literary distinction than that of B.A., and asking to be admitted into the governing body of the University, should declare that he was prepared to enter that governing body, believing in those principles with which the teaching of the University was imbued. He firmly believed that the Church of England was the hereditary successor of those who founded these Colleges; but whether that were the case or not, the Church of England had undoubtedly been in possession ever since the time of the Reformation, and had from that period inculcated her own doctrines to those who had gone there for purposes of instruction. These Colleges were founded, moreover, for the purpose of religious teaching, and not for literary instruction alone; it was not alleged that this privilege had ever been abused, yet it was now attempted to do away with religion, not merely with a view to the admission of Dissenters or Roman Catholics, but in order to admit those who could not make up their minds to the profession of any religion whatever. He was surprised to find that Dissenters, who pride themselves upon their doctrinal strictness, should give their support to a Bill which professedly aimed at doing away with all religious teaching whatever. The hon. Member for the City of London had stated that this was the chief object of the Bill. [Mr. GOSCHEN said, that his statement was that it was one of the principles of the Bill.] But there were so many principles in the Bill. One of the objects of the Bill, as admitted by the hon. Member for East Sussex, was the admission of Dissenters into the governing body. [Mr. DODSON: I said it was one of the incidents of the Bill.] He would accept the explanation of the hon. Member as perfectly satisfactory. The admission of Dissenters and of men of no religion at all to the governing bodies of the University was one of the "incidents" of the Bill. The hon. Member said that the religious teaching was not taken away by this Bill; but that was a matter upon which they must all form their own opinion. It seemed to him manifest that if persons of any religion, or of no religion, were to become members of the governing body no system of religious teaching could be adopted at the University. The hon. Member for the City of London stated, that out of 400 fellowships the immediate effect of this Bill would be to throw open eighty, and these eighty Fellows might or might not be of any creed. Some of them would probably be teachers of no religion, or professing a creed different from that of the Established Church. By such a course they would be effectually and permanently giving up the religious character of the University. It would be impossible to maintain a system of defined religious teaching if the governing bodies and the teachers were of mixed religions. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) had spoken of the injustice of the exclusion at present practised. But exclusion did not in any way affect the teaching, it only had reference to the government of the University. The hon. Member wished to maintain the present parochial system of religious teaching; but in order to do that they must maintain also the privileges which had been granted to the Established Church. There was perfect religious freedom in this country; but what was aimed at was that no privilege should be granted to the Church of England which was not also possessed by every body of Nonconformists. The admission of that principle involved the severance of the Church from the State, and leaving her without that assistance which she had, in his opinion, so well repaid by the benefits which she had conferred upon the community at large. The question, as it appeared to him, was not whether they should insist upon any particular form of subscription, but whether they should do away with Anglican tests altogether. The Bill was not introduced for the purpose of altering the mode of taking tests. The hon. Member (Mr. Goschen) had spoken too honestly to get off upon that plea; although the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Dodson) had begged for votes for the second reading in rather a different spirit to that by which the hon. Member for the City of London declared himself to be actuated. It was simply intended to do away with Anglican tests altogether. The hon. Member for the City of London, moreover, did not disguise his wish that even the head-masterships of our public schools should be thrown open to persons of any or of no religion. The hon. Member had stated his regret at having to insert in the Bill a proviso admitting persons to those positions on subscribing a declaration stating that they were members of the Church of England. It seemed, however, to him that they were desirous of admitting those whom they were bound to exclude. The moment they invaded the principle which connected the Universities and our public schools with the Church of England, that moment thousands who sent their sons to be educated there would withdraw them. Parents sent their children there because they had a faith, and not generalizations of religion—those dreams of philosophers which never took hold of the mind in the trials of life. There must be something distinct and defined in the teaching of religion or it could be nothing at all; and Oxford and Cambridge were examples of the success which attended a course of instruction which in the attainment of intellectual eminence had not lost sight of the benefits of well-directed religious training. The right hon. Gentleman in bringing forward his Bill last year excluded the Roman Catholics from any share in its benefits. [MR. E. P. BOUVERIE dissented.] He maintained that such was the practical effect. These attempts to revolutionize our Universities were really made with a view to the spread of a dreamy and mystical kind of religion. What did one of the apostles of this movement say when he came to speak of the Roman Catholics?—

> "Roman Catholics are probably too much addicted to sectarian exclusiveness to present themselves as candidates, for fellowship in a mixed society; otherwise there might, no doubt, be a difficulty in consenting to put up with the unsocial attitude and petulent airs of sectaries who have persuaded themselves that everything in Christendom is of the earth, earthy, except that Church which has most miserably soiled its spiritual essence by adulterous union with the worst powers of the earth, and by partnership, and more than partnership, in their worst crimes."

Those where the words of Mr. Goldwin Smith, and it was a sign of the objection men of his school felt to any distinct dogmatic teaching. He believed he uttered the sentiments of the great mass of the people, Members of the Church of England, and not of one-half, as stated by the hon. member for the City of London. A test upon this point was offered by the Church of England in 1861, but refused. The marriages, baptisms, and other matters, however connected entirely with the Church of England, numbered at least three-fourths, if not four-fifths of the whole. When, however, the test at the census which they offered was refused, it was unreasonable to expect them to accept the statement of the side by whom that refusal was given. He believed that as long as they chose to have a national Church, the connection of our Universities with that national Church was essential to their existence, as teaching bodies adapted for the instruction of the people for whom these advantages were intended. It was quite clear that the denominational system was a system in favour of which Englishmen felt strongly. The foundation of these Colleges was due to the effect of strong religious enthusiasm, and this fact alone should make them insist upon the utmost jealousy with regard to the religious teaching pursued. To those who came without this recommendation—who desired in a spirit apart from strong denominational religion to filch those Colleges founded from religious motives, he would put the question, "Where are your colleges or your schools?" He would ask where were the triumphs of the secular or undenominational party? If they could satisfy the demand, and not otherwise, he would acknowledge that there was something in their misty and muddy religion. He thought he could not conclude better than by quoting the words of one who, though favourable to every kind of reform calculated to afford relief to those actuated with conscientious scruples, was yet as strongly disinclined as he was to the admission of any but those connected with the Church of England into the governing bodies of the University. The words were those of the Provost of Oriel, who said—

> "Gladly admitting all and without any subscription to our society, our education, lectures, libraries, and degrees, I ask only that the University shall remain not merely a place of education and learning, but also of religion, without which it can in no just sense be a place of liberal education at all. And to this end I desire that a great national University should not be converted into a mere literary club, but that it should really educate (which is of national importance) our future clergy and laity together, that its religious principles should be both sound and known to be so, and that the members of its governing and educating body—its professors, tutors, heads, and fellows of Colleges—should study and understand the Formularies of the Church, and be able to declare *ex animo* that her Articles are agreeable to the Word of God, and her Book of Common Prayer and her Ordinal lawful, and not contrary to the Word of God."

MR. NEATE said, that last year he was not prepared to support the Bill of the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Dodson), though he should have been willing to acquiesce in the suggestions of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, believing them to possess much value, if he thought that they could be carried out practically; but on further consideration he was determined to give his concurrence to the broader assertion of the principle made in the Bill now introduced by the hon. Member for London. This was an instance of the disadvantages of delay; the longer the supporters of the existing system waited, the more they would have to give. The privileges which members of the Church now exclusively enjoyed at the University could only be defended on the assumption that the Church was the Church of the whole community; and the more the friends of the Establishment tried to retain those privileges, the more vigorously would the other part of the community be roused to contend, and the more the Church herself would have to encounter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred to what had been done in the case of endowed schools, and said that wherever there was a clear disposition of property in favour of the Church, it should be adhered to in the administration of these schools. The principle thus contended for was that where the State accepted an endowment for private purposes which were considered lawful and useful, the property would be applied to these purposes so long as they remained lawful and useful. But how could the argument apply to the case of the University? Would it now be lawful, constitutional, or right for the State to confine the privileges of the University to the members of the Church? Would any man dare to bring forward such a proposal? You might as well propose that the right of returning Members to this House should be confined to members of the Church. He contended that the State could not continue to the University that which it could not do in the first instance. Again, he thought that the distinction between the University and the Colleges had not been properly borne in mind. Strictly speaking, there was no religious teaching by the University; this rested entirely with the Colleges, and with this state of things the Bill did not interfere. It was community of worship, not the signing of a particular declaration, which bound people together; and though the subject might be beset with difficulties, those difficulties were not to be cured by requiring men to accept a test which we knew they could not in many cases submit to with perfect sincerity. Believing that it was necessary in justice to the whole community to legislate for the University in the way proposed, he should support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that as the Mover and Seconder of the Bill had appealed to Roman Catholic Members to support it, and as frequent references had been made in the course of the debate, as to the effect of the Bill upon the Roman Catholics, he might, perhaps, be allowed to explain the course which he proposed to take on this question. The Bill proposed, incidentally, to admit a Dissenting element into the governing body of the University. Now, Catholics had no desire to be so admitted. Though the University was founded in Catholic times, by Catholics, and upon Catholic trusts, he did not see in any influential section of the Catholics any desire now to interfere with the University. Reference had been made to a memorial from a section of Catholics presented to the Propaganda, and which explained the position of the Roman Catholic body in relation to this question. This memorial was drawn up by a Member of the Government, the noble Lord the Member for Kerry (Viscount Castlerosse). It was signed not very extensively—by eminent members of the Roman Catholic body—among others by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Monsell), Lord Dunraven, Lord Camoys, and some others—and was addressed to the Propaganda at Rome in these words—

> "The undersigned laymen having heard that the sacred Congregation of the Propaganda is about to consider the question whether Catholics should still be permitted to frequent the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, venture respectfully to hope that the sacred Congregation will not think its active interference necessary. They humbly express their conviction that in the case of Catholic students at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the faith and morals of their sons can be adequately protected."

This document was remitted back to the memorialists; the Propaganda refused to take any cognizance of their proceedings; and they were directed to seek instruction on the subject from their own Bishops. The memorial was dated January 21, and on the 24th of March the Catholic Bishops in England met and passed the following judgment upon the memorial:—

> "The Bishops are unanimous in their disapproval of the establishment of a Catholic College at any of the Protestant Universities; and they are further of opinion that parents ought to be in every way dissuaded from sending their children to pursue their studies at such Universities."

The Catholic Bishops in Ireland had informed the House of their sentiments, for in a petition signed by them they had unanimously asked the House for a University, the governing body and the teaching body of which should be exclusively Catholic. In asking for this the Irish Catholic Bishops made a request strictly in accordance with the principles on which the Catholic Church had always recommended that the education of the people, as well as of the higher classes, should be conducted. This was a question of denominational as opposed to mixed education. Last year the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Scully) said, "Why should we Catholics object to this Bill? In Ireland we have mixed education, and why not in England?" His answer was that the mixed education in Ireland was forced upon them by the Government against their wishes. The Catholics in Ireland had always been in favour of denominational education, and, therefore, it would be highly unfair for them to insist upon forcing mixed education upon any other class in England. Such were the views of the great bulk of the Catholics upon this subject, and such were the authoritative views of those to whom Catholics would naturally defer. It had been stated by the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) that no exclusive University could be founded now, and he referred especially to the colonies. Why, in 1852, a University, which in its government and its teaching was exclusively Catholic, was founded in Quebec.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had made no statement with regard to a University; what he said was that no exclusive national church could be founded now.

MR. HENNESSY said, that at any rate this exclusively Catholic University had received a Royal charter. But suppose the Protestants in Quebec, who were very powerful and intelligent, should claim to share in the government and teaching, the Catholic Members would be found voting unanimously in favour of retaining the exclusive character of the University, and that being so he felt in equal justice that he was bound to vote against this Bill. There was a part of the Bill not affecting Catholics, which substituted another declaration for that taken, he believed, by clergymen of the Church of England. They were told that this was an attack upon the Church of England, and he would conclude by reading a word or two upon what ought to be the action of Roman Catholics in this country when any attack was made upon the Church of England. Dr. Newman, a distinguished divine in the Catholic Church, whose immense intellectual power commanded universal respect, speaking of his own career in Oxford, said—

> "Had I not gone to Oxford, perhaps I should never have heard of the visible Church, or of tradition, or other Catholic doctrines."

No doubt the Catholics would be acting an ungrateful part if they attacked the University of Oxford. That University had not only given to Catholicism Dr. Newman, Archbishop Manning, Canon Oakley, and other distinguished men; it had done more, as the House would see from the language of Dr. Newman. Speaking of the attitude which Catholics in England should take towards the Church of England, he said in his latest work, his *Apologia*—

> "Doubtless, the national Church has hitherto been a serviceable breakwater against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own. How long this will last in the years now before us it is impossible to say, for the nation drags down its Church to its own level; but still the national Church has the same sort of influence over the nation that a periodical has upon the party which it represents, and my own idea of a Catholic's fitting attitude towards the national Church in this, its supreme hour, is that of assisting and sustaining it (if it be in our power) in the interest of dogmatic truth."

In another passage Dr. Newman advised Catholics to do nothing to weaken the hold of the Established Church upon the public mind, or upon "those great Christian and Catholic principles and doctrines which it has up to this time successfully preached." It would be impertinent in him to say that he agreed with Dr. Newman; but he was happy to find that this eminent man supported the view which he had always taken of his duty as a Catholic when the Church of England had been assailed. He had not assisted those who in this House called upon Catholics to attack the Church of England, and to that course he should adhere.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he regretted, but was not surprised at, the opinion given by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hennessy) with respect to this Bill. He should feel much greater regret, however, if he thought that the opinion of the hon. and learned Member represented that of English Catholics generally, and if, when the University of Oxford was restored to its character of a thoroughly national institution, and when it was open to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, the members of the Roman Catholic Church should still feel themselves compelled to decline the benefits which the University would offer them. According to Dr. Newman, who had been quoted by the hon. and learned Member, definite dogmatic teaching was essential to safety in this world and the next; and he enforced this teaching by a great spiritual and supernatural authority which forbade inquiry and required submission. He imagined, perhaps, that if his co-religionists were admitted to the University, their faith would be in danger, as they would be among a vast majority of persons professing a different faith. These views were perfectly intelligible, but they only showed how untenable were the views of members of the Established Church who thought that their creed would be endangered by the presence of a certain number of their fellow-countrymen whom this Bill proposed to admit to the University. The Bill contained so many good things that there was an *embarras de richesses*; but as he was in the happy position of being able to agree with all the provisions of the Bill he felt no difficulty on this score. In the first place, it would emancipate the lay members of the Church from the necessity of accepting without reserve the truth of a vast body of controversial divinity as a condition of receiving the chief honours and emoluments of the University; and, in the second place, it would relieve Nonconformists from those restrictions which prevented them from reaping the full honours and advantages of a University which, in his opinion, ought to be a national one. He was gratified to find the unanimity with which leading Members on both sides of the House, including, as he understood, the two Members for the University, agreed that the time had come when they might safely relieve the youthful laymen of the Church from the necessity of subscribing those complicated theological formulæ which until recently beset every stage of their academical career, and still met them at its close. Oxford students passed their student life in an atmosphere of absolute freedom. All subjects were freely discussed; all books upon all subjects, including the most sacred, were bought and read; and there was everything to stimulate inquiry and thought. But after passing three years or more in this free intellectual atmosphere, the young man arrived at a stage of his career when he must undergo the temptation of submitting to a vast mass of controversial divinity as the condition of admittance to the higher privileges of the University and the emoluments of the Colleges. This applied to the most active-minded men in the University—those who were qualified for fellowships. If the Bill did nothing more than remove this painful necessity he should regard it with the greatest satisfaction, and would rejoice if members of the Church at the University were no longer subject to a test which made them in after-life neither better, wiser, more conscientious, nor even more religious, than they would have been without it. As to the second part of the Bill, which proposed to throw open the University to Nonconformists, the House would remember that originally Oxford was a national University. Nonconformity, which at first did not exist at all, was not afterwards expected to be permanent. But now that so large and so important a section of the community were, and in all human probability would continue to be, outside the pale of the Church, the time had come when the Universities ought to revert to their original national character. As to the objection that the dogmatic teaching of the University would be destroyed, he confessed that every year of his life he was less inclined to attach importance to it in comparison with the great principles and objects of a Christian life. But was it true that at Oxford every member of the University was subjected to a definite dogmatic teaching? He understood that Nonconformist students were invited to attend there, and that Dissenters could establish private Halls; but it could not be intended that Nonconformist students should submit to the Thirty-nine Articles, and be taught the Church Catechism. If, therefore, there was any evil in relinquishing dogmatic teaching in the case of all members of the University, that disaster had already happened. For his part, fearing nothing for the interests of the Church or of the University, of which he was a grateful and attached member, if it were thrown open to all classes of his countrymen, he should give his cordial support to this measure.

Mr. SCULLY said, it had been stated in the course of the debate that a section of the Catholic Members were going to oppose the Bill, acting under directions from the Propaganda. As neither on this nor on any other occasion had any such influences been brought to bear upon him, he felt some surprise at this rumour; but his surprise evaporated when he heard the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy). Wishing it to be understood that he expressed only his own individual sentiments, he (Mr. Scully) would say a few words as a Member of the only section in this House who had not spoken upon the question —he meant the Liberal Catholic Members. The hon. and learned Member (Mr. Hennessy), with great consistency, always went with his party; but he had no right to put himself forward as representing the Catholic feeling of the country. He (Mr. Scully) should support this Bill, as he had supported it last year. He was not going to change his vote, for he believed that whatever reasons in favour of the Bill were good last Session were good now. The right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) having supported the Bill of last year, now took the consistent course of not supporting it in the present Session. The hon. Member for the King's County had professed to quote an argument of his last year about mixed education, but he entirely misquoted it. The hon. Member, he believed, did not vote on the Bill last year, and did not remain in the House during the debate, but went frequently in and out.

MR. HENNESSY, in explanation, said, the fact was that as soon as the hon. and learned Member rose to speak last year, he, in common with a great many other Members, left the House.

MR. SCULLY thought that that circumstance accounted for the mistake which the hon. Member had made in misrepresenting his (Mr. Scully's) argument. The hon. Member's conduct on the present occasion, as well as on every other occasion, was quite consistent with his character as one of the Tory Catholics, and sole representative of that distinguished body. As for himself, he had been brought up in Liberal principles, and could not admit in that House that the fact of his father having been at Cambridge derogated from his religious principles. With the exception of the observations of the hon. Member for the King's County, he had heard no speech denying that the principle of the Bill was right, though it might probably be much amended in Committee. He voted for the Bill last year, and he could reconcile his conscience again to vote for it now, though he feared that it was an Oxford University Test Bill in more senses than one. He believed that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not represent the University of Oxford there would be no shortcomings on his part, and the sooner he got rid of the incubus of Oxford the better it would be for him. It was the most ardent desire of the right hon. Gentleman's admirers in that House that for his own sake and for the sake of the public, the right hon. Gentleman and the University of Oxford should be separated. The Bill was intended first, to relieve the consciences of the members of the Established Church; secondly, to benefit the Dissenters; and thirdly, to benefit the Roman Catholics. He did not think it would do the Roman Catholics much good, for although they had been admissible to the Cabinet since 1829, not one of them had ever got there; and in the University of Oxford they would be infinitely more powerless than they were in Parliament. Then, how were the Dissenters to be benefited? At Balliol there were a certain number of nominations for scholarships belonging to the University of Glasgow, and most of those scholars were not members of the Church of England, but they contrived to swallow the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Thirty-one Articles of the Athanasian Creed into the bargain—making seventy articles altogether. With regard to the members of the Church of England, who had to swear to the Thirty-nine Articles, there were a great many boys from Eton and Rugby who did not understand them, and who, if they had considered the Articles, would not have sworn to them. But, although he did not suppose that either the Roman Catholics or Dissenters would be much benefited by the Bill, still as it was a step in advance he saw no objection to going into Committee upon it. He only hoped that those who insisted that the Universities ought to impart a religious education would give their support next Tuesday to the Motion of the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) in favour of a chartered Catholic University of Ireland.

MR. HENLEY said, he found it difficult to understand what was the true object of the hon. Mover and those who supported him. The right hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) had told the House that in his judgment the object of the Bill was twofold—first, to emancipate laymen from taking tests with which they did not agree; and secondly, to emancipate Dissenters. But the hon. Member for London (Mr. Goschen) who moved the second reading said that the principle of the Bill was not to emancipate Dissenters —that was simply a result. Under these circumstances he could not understand how the right hon. Member for Louth could support the second reading of the Bill; because the House had been distinctly informed of what he, for one, did not know before, that negotiations or communications on this subject passed last year, and that distinct offers were made that lay members should not have to take the tests, and that free power to open Halls to persons not belonging to the Church of England should be given. That arrangement would have completely emancipated both Dissenters and laymen; but the offer was distinctly refused by those who had charge of the Bill. He would not say anything upon that matter, except that the right hon. Member for Louth had no right to use it in the sense he did, because it was coupled with the condition that the educational power should remain as it was, and there would not have been that complete doing away with religious teaching in the University which the hon. Member for London's speech indicated as likely to be the result of the present measure. The right hon. Member for Louth said that it was hard that young men at Oxford should be perplexed with a mass of controversial divinity, and that they had the most perfect freedom. Certainly, as far as his experience went, the latter part of the statement was quite accurate. In his early days it was said that they found their way across the country well enough; and he now read in the newspapers that there was much exercise there in jumping in sacks and in catching pigs with greased tails. Let the House consider what the Member for London proposed. The hon. Gentleman said that the object of the Bill was to introduce perfect freedom of discussion. Now, if that be so, he should like to know what would be the perplexity of religious matters. There would be the Roman Catholic against the Church of England, and the Presbyterian against both. There would be the Nonconformists of every sort, and every kind of perplexity. In what could it all end? Simply in indifference or nothing. The right hon. Member for Louth, speaking almost with ridicule of what he called definite dogmatic teaching, pointed out in contradistinction the benefits of Christian life. But how could the right hon. Member get the principles on which Christian life was founded without this dogmatic teaching? It was the belief in these dogmas, if they chose so to call them, that formed the foundation of the practice of Christian life—the belief in a Maker, a Redeemer, and another world. What, then, could be the object of the supporters of this Bill if they would not accept emancipation for lay members and abolition of tests for Dissenters? The only remaining object, he believed, was to deal with the right of the Universities to their property. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) threw in the teeth of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Lord Robert Cecil) that he had not commented on that portion of the speech of the hon. Member for London which dealt with the property of the University, and consequently one was tempted to consider that that must have reference to what was the serious object of the Bill, though he could not understand before what was the object of the hon. Member for London in labouring so much to prove that all this right of property in the University was solely dependent on an Act of Parliament. That point was taken up again by the hon. Member for Bradford who had handled it in a very cautious manner; but the hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate), seeing what it led to, did not choose to be excluded from applying the argument to the property of the Church generally. The hon. Member, drawing a curious distinction, said it was out of the question to touch the property of the Church of England, but that as no man in founding a University would pretend to found it wholly for the purposes of the Church of England, therefore it would be quite lawful for them to deal with all this matter in reference to the University as they pleased. But if that argument was good, what would be its logical conclusion? Was it not equally applicable to the property of the Church. Therefore he was drawn to the conclusion that the object of those who refused the offer made with respect to lay Members and Dissenters was to establish the principle that not only the property of the University, but the property of the Church, was national, and that that Parliament could deal with it as it liked. He repeated, with regard to dogmatic teaching, that he could not understand how they could have denominational or religious teaching either in a small school or in the University without it. He believed that the object sought by the Bill, if it were not that purpose he had already alluded to, was, not to accommodate Nonconformists, but to let in freethinkers, who would upset everything. Therefore he should vote against the measure, and he was glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had at last found his way out of the cloud in which he had appeared for some time lost and had avowed his objections to it. They had been told that this matter would not affect the Colleges, where religious teaching would remain the same as now, and the hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate) spoke a great deal about the Act of Uniformity. If that were so, what became of the case of the unfortunate Presbyterian gentleman for whom the sympathies of the House had been excited by the hon. Member for London, and who was described as being obliged to give up his educational course when he arrived at a certain point? How was it that the Act of Uniformity did not keep that gentleman out of College altogether? He believed that if the present Bill were passed the same teaching would not be maintained in the Colleges as now, and he was of opinion that if there were to be contrariety of teaching the same result would ensue as in the schools of America, which had degenerated into mere secular places of teaching. Such a result would be a great misfortune. He agreed with the hon. Member for the Elgin district (Mr. Grant Duff) that a University should be national, and should give a national education; but that would be good for nothing unless it had a religious basis, and without a religious basis it would not be accepted by the people of this country.

MR. MONSELL rose to address the House amid loud cries for a division; and was understood to say that the Bill, with a single exception, dealt not with the Colleges but with the University of Oxford; and the case of fellows, who were obliged to take certain tests, might be dealt with in Committee. He would be as much opposed as any one to the introduction of any jarring religions into the educational bodies of the Colleges, for that would be destructive of the spirit on which Oxford University was founded. That spirit he desired to preserve, and if he thought that the present Bill would directly or indirectly interfere with it, he would be the first to oppose it. He did not believe that the measure affected the fundamental principles of religious education, and that it would remove a grievance to which those people who did not belong to the Church of England were at present exposed as far as regarded the University, and not the Colleges of Oxford, and he should therefore vote in favour of the second reading.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE said, that he had not, as stated by the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy), expressly excluded Roman Catholics from his Bill of last year. His Bill was proposed to apply to certain cases, in which, by the Act of Uniformity, fellows were required to make a declaration of conformity with the Church of England. There was another statute in existence which required the oath of abjuration to be taken by Fellows, and Roman Catholics could not take that oath; but he did not wish to embarrass himself with that matter, and therefore left it as it stood. He understood that the object of the present Bill was simply to place Nonconformists on a perfect equality with those belonging to the Church of England. This was not a religious question, but a question of civil right. The corporations affected by the Bill were all civil corporations, and the right to belong to them was one which ought to be enjoyed by every subject in the realm. Not only were the English Protestant Nonconformists excluded from the Universities by the tests, but also Scotch Presbyterians, whose Universities were entirely free from tests, were equally affected by them. He would say nothing about the exclusion of a large number of lay members of the Church of England, because it was now admitted that, with regard to them, these tests should no longer be imposed. He was convinced that no one who had conscientiously examined these tests would take them willingly and *ex animo* after mature reflection. They were, moreover, quite unnecessary. They were told, forsooth, that these tests were required for the security of the Church of England; but those who said that must have a very weak faith in the truth upon which that Church rested. Did those tests in any way secure the religious teaching of the University? Why, they had nothing whatever to do with it—no more, in fact, than the oath which Members took at the table of that House had. It was the Professors of the University who had to do with its religious teaching, and they administered that religious teaching, not because they took those tests, but because of the statutes founding the Professorships which they held. It was also said that in these tests they had a security for uniformity of belief in the University; but the fact was lost sight of that they were taken only once for all in the course of a man's life, and often at an early age, and they were no security whatever for the belief of a man some years after he had taken them. Why, those very Freethinkers of whom the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) spoke with such alarm had many of them sprung from the University of Oxford and were still members of Congregation and had votes in the Convocation of the University. Indeed, it was plainly impossible, unless it were perpetually taken like a dose of physic every three months, that a test could be any security for continued uniformity of religious belief.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 206; Noes 190: Majority 16.

Main Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Wednesday* next.

AYES.

Acland, T. D.
Acton, Sir J. D.
Adair, H. E.
Adam, W. P.
Antrobus, E.
Aytoun, R. S.
Bagwell, J.
Bailey, C.
Baines, E.
Baring, T. G.
Barnes, T.
Bass, M. T.
Bazley, T.
Beaumont, W. B.
Berkeley, hon. H. F.
Biddulph, Colonel M.
Black, A.
Blake, J. A.
Blencowe, J. G.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bouverie, hon. P. P.
Brady, Dr.
Bright, J.
Browne, Lord J. T.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Bury, Viscount
Butler, C. S.
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carnegie, hon. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Cheetham, J.
Childers, H. C. E.
Churchill, Lord A. S.
Clay, J.
Clifford, C. C.
Clive, G.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Corbally, M. E.
Cox, W.
Crawford, R. W.
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodson, J. G.
Douglas, Sir C.
Doulton, F.
Duke, Sir J.
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Enfield, Viscount
Ennis, J.
Esmonde, J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, J. C.
Ewing, H. E. Crum-
Fenwick, E. M.
Fermoy, Lord
Finlay, A. S.
Finch, C. Wyme-
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Foley, H. W.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, C.
Forster, W. E.
Forster, W. O.
Fortescue, hon. F. D.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gavin, Major
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Glyn, G. C.
Glyn, G. G.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Greene, J.
Gregory, W. H.
Grenfell, H. R.
Greville, Colonel F.
Gurney, S.
Hadfield, G.
Hanbury, R.
Handley, J.
Hankey, T.
Hayter, rt. hn. Sir W. G.
Headlam, rt. hon. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Henley, Lord
Hibbert, J. T.
Hodgkinson, G.
Hodgson, K. D.
Holland, E.
Horsman, rt. hon. E.
Ingham, R.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Johnstone, Sir J.
Kennedy, T.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, A. W.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Layard, A. H.
Langton, W. H. G.
Lanigan, J.
Lawrence, J. C.
Lawson, W.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lever, J. O.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
MacEvoy, E.
Mackie, J.
Mackinnon, W. A.
M'Mahon, P.
Maguire, J. F.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Martin, J.
Matheson, A.
Matheson, Sir J.
Miller, W.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moncrieff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Moor, H.
Moore, C.
Morris, W.
Morrison, W.
Neate, C.
North, F.
O'Brien, Sir P.
Ogilvy, Sir J.
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
Owen, Sir H. O.
Padmore, R.
Paget, Lord C.
Peto, Sir S. M.
Pilkington, J.
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Ponsonby, hon. A.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.
Powell, J. J.
Price, R. G.
Pryse, E. L.
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Ricardo, O.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, D.
Robertson, H.
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
Russell, Sir W.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Schneider, H. W.
Scholefield, W.
Scrope, G. P.
Scully, V.
Seely, C.
Shelly, Sir J. V.
Sheridan, H. B.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J. B.
Smith, M. T.
Staniland, M.
Stanley, hon. W. O.
Stanfield, J.
Steel, J.
Stuart, Col. Crich-
Sykes, Col. W. H.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Taylor, P. A.
Thompson, H. S.
Tollemache, hon. F. J.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Trelawny, Sir J. S.
Turner, J. A.
Vandeleur, Colonel
Vernon, H. F.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Waldron, L.
Warner, E.
Watkin, E. W.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Westhead, J. P. Brown-
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, J.
White, hon. L.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wyld, J.
Wyvill, M.

TELLERS.

Goschen, G. J.
Duff, M. E. G.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Anson, hon. Major
Arbuthnott, hon. Gen. Sir H.
Archdall, Captain M.
Baillie, H. J.
Barrow, W. H.
Barttelot, Colonel
Beach, Sir M.
Beach, W. W. B.
Beecroft, G. S.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. Pack-
Bernard, hon. Colonel
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bovill, W.
Boyle, hon. G. F.
Bramley-Moore, J:
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brooks, R.
Bromley, W. D.
Burghley, Lord
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cargill, W. W.
Cartwright, Colonel
Cave, S.
Chapman, J.
Clive, Capt. hon. G. W.
Cobbold J. C.
Cochrane, A. D.R.W.B.
Cole, hon. H.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Collins, T.
Conolly, T.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Courtenay, Lord
Cubitt, G.
Damer, S. D.
Dick, F.
Dickson, Colonel
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. A.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, E. C.
Egerton, hon. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Farrer, J.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Ferrand, W.
Eleming, T. W.
Floyer, J.
Forster, Sir G.
Fraser, Sir W. A.
Gallwey, Sir W. P.
Galway, Viscount
George, J.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Goddard, A. L.
Graham, Lord W.
Greenhall, G.
Greenwood J.
Gray, Lt.-Colonel
Griffith, C. D.
Grogan, Sir E.
Haliburton, T. C.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, Viscount
Hamilton, I. T.
Hardy, G.
Hardy, J.
Harvey, R. B.
Hervey, Lord A.
Hervey, Lord A. H. C.
Hassard, M.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Heathcote, hon. G. H.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Hennessy, J. P.
Henniker, Lord
Herbert, hon. P. E.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Holford, R. S.
Horsfall, T. B.
Hotham, Lord
Howes, E.
Hubbard, J. G.
Humberston, P. S.
Humphery, W. H.
Hunt, G. W.
Jervis, Capt.
Jolliffe, rt. hon. Sir W. G. H.
Jolliffe, H. H.
Jones, D.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kendall, N.
Kennard, R. W.
Ker, D. S.
King, J. K.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, Col.
Laird, J.
Langton, W. G.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, Major C.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, Sir B.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lowther, hon. Col.
Lyall, G.
Lygon, hon. F.
Malcolm, J. W.
Malins, R.
Miller, T. J.
Mills, A.
Mitford, W. T.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Mordaunt, Sir C.
Morgan, O.
Morritt, W. J. S.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Mundy, W.
Murray, W.
Naas, Lord
Newdegate, C. N.
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Neill, E.
Packe, C. W.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palk, Sir L.
Papillon, P. O.
Parker, Major W.
Patten, Col. W.
Paull, H.
Peacocke, G. M. W.
Pennant, hon. Col.
Percy, Earl
Pevensey, Viscount
Philips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Powys-Lybbe, P. L.
Repton, G. W. J.
Rogers, J. J.
Rolt, J.
Rose, W. A.
Salt, T.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwyn, C. J.
Shirley, E. P.
Smith, A.
Smith, S. G.
Somerset, Colonel
Somes, J.
Stanhope. J. B.
Stirling, W.
Stronge, Sir J. M.
Stuart, Lieut.-Col. W.
Surtees, H. E.
Taylor, Colonel
Torrens, R.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Trevor, Lord A. E. H.
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Verner, Sir W.
Verner, E. W.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walter, J.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Whiteside, rt. hon. J.
Whitmore, H.
Williams, F. M.
Wood, B. T.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.

TELLERS.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Northcote, Sir S.

PRINCESS OF WALES.—ANSWER TO ADDRESS.

Viscount BURY (Treasurer of the Household) *reported* Her Majesty's Answer to Address [8th June] as follows:—

I thank you sincerely for your loyal and dutiful Address on the Birth of the Prince My Grandson; and I receive with much satisfaction the renewed assurance of your attachment to my Person and Family.

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS BILL.

Resolutions [June 13] *reported,*

Bill "for providing a further sum towards defraying the expenses of constructing Fortifications for the protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Ports of Dover and Portland, and of creating a Central Arsenal," *ordered* to be brought in by The Marquess of Hartington and Viscount Palmerston.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 215.]

HARBOURS TRANSFER.

On Motion of Mr. Milner Gibson, Bill to transfer from the Admiralty to the Board of Trade powers and duties relative to certain Harbours, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Lord Clarence Paget.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 216.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 15, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *First Reading*— Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * (157); Colonial Laws Validity * (158); Colonial Marriages Validity * (159); Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c. Amendment * (160); Metalliferous Mines (No. 2) * (163.)

Second Reading — Dockyard Extensions * (143); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) (144); Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment * (117); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) (Provisional Orders Confirmation) (No. 2) * (147); Land Debentures * (112).

Select Committee — On Locomotives on Roads, Earl Malmesbury *added.*

Committee — Partnership Amendment (123); Militia Ballots Suspension *; Militia Pay.*

Referred to Select Committee—Mortgage Debentures (107); Land Debentures (Ireland) * (113); Land Debentures *nominated.**

Report — Militia Ballots Suspension *; Militia Pay.*

Third Reading—Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) * (127).

COURTS OF JUSTICE BUILDING BILL.

PETITION OF ETHELDREDA BROWNING.

Lord STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE *presented* a Petition of Etheldreda Browning for the Amendment of the Courts of Justice Building Bill, who owned seventeen houses in New Boswell Court, Lincoln's Inn, immediately contiguous to the site of the new Law Courts. This lady derived her only means of living from the rents of those houses, and she stated that in consequence of the frequent notices which had been served upon her in reference to the proposed scheme for building the new Courts of Justice she had lost the chief portion of her rents since the beginning of the year 1860. Although he (Lord Stratford de Redcliffe) was not exactly aware of what could be done for the lady's relief, he thought her case worthy of some consideration, when the question of compensating the owners of the property taken under the Bill arose.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, he quite agreed that the case referred to by the noble Lord was a very hard one, and although he had great doubts whether there was any legal mode of compensating the lady, still he was glad the subject had been brought under the notice of their Lordships. In consequence of the various schemes which had been laid before Parliament in reference to the proposed new Courts of Justice, notices were served upon the Petitioner in each consecutive year—in 1860, 1861, 1863, 1864, and 1865—that her property would be required. Those notices were not acted upon; but, as the fact of their having been served was well known, she had lost the chief part of her rents since the year 1860, persons being unwilling to take houses out of which they would be liable to be turned on short notice. He trusted that when the question of compensation arose under the Bill the claims of this lady would receive some consideration.

Lord REDESDALE said, that while regretting the hardship Mrs. Browning had experienced, he could not see how her case differed from those of hundreds of persons who had been subjected to the same inconveniences from the notices that had been served on them by the metropolitan railways of their intention to take their property. Neither did he see from what source the compensation was to be derived.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the lady referred to had made frequent applications to him on the subject now before the House, and had had an interview with him to explain her case. He confessed he felt very much for her, but he did not see how she could be compensated under the present Bill for her five years' losses. However, the evil arising from notices of this description had attained such proportions that he thought the subject ought to be dealt with by some distinct legislative enactment.

PARTNERSHIP AMENDMENT BILL.

(No. 123.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 (The Advance of Money on Contract to receive a Share of Profits not to constitute the Lender a Partner.)

Lord ST. LEONARDS expressed his disapprobation of the principle involved in the clause, which he feared would be calculated to embarrass the transactions of trade.

After a few words from Lord Chelmsford and Lord Wensleydale, which were inaudible,

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 2, 3, and 4 *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (In Case of Bankruptcy, &c., Lender not to rank with other Creditors.)

Lord CHELMSFORD said, he believed that that clause, which was the only one in the Bill that proposed to give any protection to the general creditor, would require careful consideration before it was sanctioned by the House.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR suggested that his noble and learned Friend should submit to their Lordships any Amendment of the clause he might think advisable on the bringing up of the Report.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, that on the bringing up of the Report he should propose a clause to the effect—

> "That if the lender of any such loan shall withdraw the same or any part of it from the trade or business in question, and if within a year afterwards the trader shall be adjudged a bankrupt or insolvent, or make any agreement with his creditors to pay less than 20*s.* in the pound, or should die in insolvent circumstances, the amount so withdrawn shall be liable to be applied to the payment of the creditors."

LORD CRANWORTH thought the Bill was already strong enough to prevent fraud.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

LORD BROUGHAM, on the Report, said, he highly approved of this amendment of the law. It was a natural and useful consequence of those great improvements in our commercial law, the limited liability and the abolition of the Usury Laws; and beside its other merits, it had that of relieving the courts from the most subtle distinctions which had been introduced rather perhaps by the process and decisions of courts, and some of which by their refinements and subtleties reflected no very great credit upon these tribunals.

An Amendment made; The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 162.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPPLEMENTAL (No. 4) BILL—(No. 144.)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

LORD CHELMSFORD *presented* a Petition of Charles Hay Frewen, Esq., a landowner in the neighbourhood of Hastings, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill. He (Lord Chelmsford) regarded the Provisional Order to which the Bill referred as so objectionable that he should have opposed the second reading had not the proper course been pointed out by Parliament. The 77th section of the Local Government Act provided that in case of any petition being presented to either House of Parliament against any Provisional Order, the Bill must be referred to a Select Committee, and the petitioner be allowed to appear by counsel and oppose it, as in the case of a Private Bill. This Provisional Order proposed to take compulsorily the land of Mr. Frewen, the petitioner, for the purpose of widening and improving a certain lane at Hastings. There were two formidable objections to this—one in point of policy, the other in point of law. Local Boards had large powers entrusted to them, which were peculiarly liable to abuse; and it was because he believed these powers had not been properly applied in the present instance that he wished to explain the circumstances before the Bill went to a Committee. The Provisional Order had been made at the instigation of a Mr. Pope, who had no property within the district, but who was the owner of a tract of building land outside it. Mr. Pope applied to the Local Board, and told them that if they would make an order to widen and improve this land, he would pay the whole of the purchase money of the land required and legal costs, and contribute £100 towards the improvement. Without doubt these powers were not entrusted to Local Boards for the benefit of individuals, although individuals might incidentally be benefited, but for the advantage of the inhabitants generally; and it was therefore against public policy that an Act like this for the benefit of a private individual should be passed. Then as to the legal objection. He contended that all the Local Government Act incorporated the Public Health (1848) Act, which required that land to be taken for improvements should be taken by agreement, and by agreement only, and not compulsorily, as in this case. It might be said that several Provisional Orders before this had been sanctioned; but if so he could only say he was sorry for it, as they were perfectly illegal, though if the parties were agreed no great harm might be done. It had been stated that the Court of Queen's Bench had decided against Mr. Frewen, but that was altogether a mistake. An application was made for a writ of certiorari to remove the order into the Court of Queen's Bench for the purpose of its being quashed. When the rule came to be argued, it was held that the Provisional Order was of no value till it had been confirmed by an Act of Parliament; and as it might never receive that confirmation, the Court, therefore, had no power then to consider the matter.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY could only say, in answer, that it was a mistake to suppose that the object of this Provisional Order was to benefit a particular individual. This Provisional Order proceeded from the body entrusted with the local management of the town, and if they recommended the improvement the inference was that it was for the accommodation of the public. In fact, the action in this matter had been taken at the instance of the ratepayers of the district, and the widening of the lane in question was regarded as a great public improvement. With regard to the legal point raised, he did not feel competent to dispute the position laid down by the noble and learned Lord. He could only say this, that during the last five Sessions of Parliament not fewer than twenty-five Acts had passed on the supposition of powers being possessed by local improvement bodies to take lands compulsorily for widening and improving streets. It was quite true that in the original Act for the improvement of towns no compulsory powers were given; but it was contended, whether rightly or wrongly he did not know, that these compulsory powers were incidentally transferred to them by the Act of 1858, which incorporated the Lands Clauses Act. He quite agreed that the noble and learned Lord had done right in calling attention to this case.

LORD CRANWORTH made an observation on the question of law which was inaudible.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND said, there was a great desire at Hastings that this useful project should be carried out. The lane or road which it was sought to widen led from the town to the country, and was at present much too narrow for the traffic.

LORD REDESDALE thought that the question of law involved in the Bill should not be left to the decision of a Select Committee. If this were a case in which one person was seeking to obtain rights over the property of another for his own advantage the House should refuse its sanction to the projected improvement.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly and *committed;* the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Lord Chelmsford

MORTGAGE DEBENTURES BILL.

Referred to a Select Committee: The Lords following were named of the Committee; the Committee to meet on Monday next, at One o'Clock, and to appoint their own Chairman:—

Ld. Chancellor.	L. Boyle.
D. Marlborough.	L. Stanley of Alderley.
M. Salisbury.	L. Cranworth.
M. Bath.	L. Saint Leonards.
E. Malmesbury.	L. Chelmsford.
V. Hutchinson.	

LAND DEBENTURES (IRELAND) BILL.

(No. 113.)

REFERRED TO SELECT COMMITTEE.

On Motion of The Earl of CORK the said Bill was *referred* to the same Select Committee.

LAND DEBENTURES BILL.

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and *referred* to the same Select Committee.

LOCOMOTIVES ON ROADS BILL.

(No. 108.) SELECT COMMITTEE.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE moved, that the Earl of Malmesbury be added to the Select Committee on this Bill.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he would take this opportunity to call attention to the inconvenience of the new Standing Order, which required a day's notice for the nomination of any noble Lord to serve on a Select Committee. Formerly the Committee was formed, and Peers could be added as the exigency demanded. He felt great interest in the Locomotives on Roads Bill, and on Tuesday he mentioned to his noble Friend who had charge of the measure (the Earl of Hardwicke) that he should wish to serve on the Select Committee. A day's notice being necessary, his noble Friend had been unable to move the addition of his name till this evening; but the Committee had been sitting all day, and, perhaps, had got through their business. Again, in the case of the Mortgage Debentures Bill, he himself was anxious to substitute two names for those of the Postmaster General, who had told him he would be unable to attend, and his noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury), who would be prevented from serving owing to domestic affliction; but, as notice was necessary, he should not be able to make the change until Monday, so that at this late period of the Session two valuable days would be lost in consequence of the operation of the new Order.

THE EARL OF **HARDWICKE** said, the new system retarded public business.

EARL **STANHOPE** defended the Standing Order. The old system was indefensible, as under it the House had no control over the nomination of its Committees. Formerly the list was settled by a leading Member on each side of the House, and the only notice the House had of the Committee was when the Lord Chancellor read the names from the woolsack. The change of system had first been tried in the House of Commons, and gave general satisfaction, and the objections which had been urged arose rather from the inconveniences incident to the introduction of a new system. If any improvements in detail could be suggested he would be glad to adopt them; but he had settled the Resolution on which the new system was founded after consultation with the Clerk of the Parliament, and he believed it would be of service.

EARL **GREY** said, he thought the new system was calculated to insure regularity in the proceedings, and that the Standing Order should be adhered to.

THE EARL OF **DONOUGHMORE** said, the old system worked more smoothly.

LORD **STANLEY** OF **ALDERLEY** concurred with his noble Friend (Earl Stanhope) in thinking that the new Order had a beneficial operation.

THE EARL OF **CORK** thought the Resolution was likely to lead to great inconvenience, and if he met with any support he would move its repeal.

LORD **REDESDALE** thought that it would be very objectionable to move alterations in their Orders upon the spur of the moment. They had certainly found the greatest advantage in referring Bills to Select Committees, who put them into a satisfactory shape before they came to their Lordships for consideration; and, therefore, it was a course which, instead of delaying, frequently expedited the progress of Bills. Upon the present occasion a delay of two or three days was of no consequence, because they certainly were not so near the end of the Session as to render this short period of importance. With regard to the Standing Order, no doubt it might occasionally cause inconvenience; but, speaking generally, notice on the change of names was just as necessary as on the original nomination.

After a few words from the Earl of HARROWBY and Earl STANHOPE, Motion *agreed to;* the Earl of Malmesbury added to the Select Committee on the Bill.

METALLIFEROUS MINES (NO. 2) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill relating to Metalliferous Mines Was *presented* by The Lord ROSSE; read 1ª; and to be *printed.* (No. 109.)

House adjourned at a quarter-past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, June 15, 1865.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRITS ISSUED—For Liskeard *v.* Ralph Osborne, esquire, Manor of Hempholme; for Coventry *v.* Sir Joseph Paxton, deceased.

SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report*—On Master and Servant (No. 370).

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—Colonial Docks Loans; Navy and Army Expenditure, 1863 and 1864.

Ordered—Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance.*

Second Reading — Controller of the Exchequer and Public Audit [208]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) * [210]; Parsonages * [205] [*Lords*].

Committee — Malt Duty [160]; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks [198]; Inland Revenue (*re-comm.*) [207]; Law of Evidence [20] [No Report]; Record of Title (Ireland) [151] [*Lords*]; Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. * [197]; Crown Suits, &c. (*re-comm.*) * [206] —R.P.; Kingstown Harbour * [185]; Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * [201].

Report—Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) * [168]; Malt Duty [160]; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks [198]; Inland Revenue (*re-comm.*) [207]; Record of Title Ireland [151] [*Lords*]; Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. * [197]; Kingstown Harbour * [185]; Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * [201].

Considered as amended—Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) * [189]; Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions * [190]; Penalties Law Amendment * [213].

Third Reading — Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * [178]; Roman Catholic Oath [86]; Navy and Marines (Wills) * [188].

Withdrawn—Court of Chancery (Ireland) * [11] [Mr. Attorney General]; Justices of the Peace (Discretionary Powers) * [69].

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION.

SPECIAL REPORT.

Colonel **WILSON PATTEN** *reported* from the Committee of Selection; That they had not received from Mr. Franklyn, one of the Members of the Committee on Group No. 15 A of Railway Bills, or from Mr. Pease, one of the Members of the Committee on the Hyde Park Gate Estate Bill, either the Declaration required by the 113th Standing Order, or any excuse in lieu thereof. At this period of the Session it was very difficult for the Committee of Selection to dispose of the remaining business of the House, and while every endeavour had been made on the part of the Committee to procure the attendance of Members, he saw by the Votes of the House last (Wednesday) evening that the Chairman of a Committee in the exercise of his discretion moved that the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Franklyn) should be discharged from his attendance on the Committee, and the result had been that all parties attending the Committee had been subjected to great inconvenience and expense, the Committee being unable to sit in consequence of the absence of the hon. Member. He hoped that the hon. Members of the House would hesitate in future before they acceded to a similar Motion, and had he been in the House he should have moved that the hon. Member for Poole should attend the Committee forthwith. However, as the Motion had been agreed to, he should not go further into the matter, but he hoped for the future hon. Members would give all the assistance in their power to get through the private business of the House, and not lightly endeavour to excuse themselves from attendance.

Report to lie upon the table.

INDIA—ARMY PROMOTION.

QUESTION.

Mr. **COBBOLD** said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Captain Jervis), he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether he has received any Despatch or Document from the Government of any Presidency in India, pointing out that the measures devised to redress the complaints of the Officers of the local service have created a grievance for the Officers of the Staff Corps, by causing not only supersession of the Staff Corps by local Officers, but even supersession of Staff Corps Officers by Staff Corps Officers; and stating that the supersession throughout the whole service has been aggravated fifty-fold by the Brevet promotion given to the local Service; if so, whether he will place the same upon the table of the House?

Sir **CHARLES WOOD** said, in reply, that the Government of Madras had pointed out that which the Indian Government at home knew well before, that an uniform rule of army promotion would lead to the supersession of some officers who had been peculiarly fortunate in their promotion; and they had sent home a list of officers who would be superseded. It did not, however, appear that except in a very few instances the rule referred to had materially altered the position of officers.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

QUESTION.

Mr. **J. B. SMITH** said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether it be his intention to continue in future the practice of bringing forward the Indian Budget a few days before the close of the Session, as heretofore; and, if not, what arrangements he has made for making up the Indian financial accounts to such a period as will enable him to lay them upon the table of the House on the meeting of Parliament, and to bring forward the Indian Budget in the early part of the Session instead of at the close.

Sir **CHARLES WOOD** said, in reply, that the day upon which he should bring forward the Indian Budget must depend upon the progress which was made with Supply; but he hoped to make his statement either on that day week or on Monday week.

Mr. **ARTHUR MILLS** said, he would beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he intends to propose any Loan for the service of India during the present year?

Sir **CHARLES WOOD** said, that he had already stated that he entertained no such intention.

Mr. **AYRTON** said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Baronet has said that he intends to bring forward Resolutions with regard to Indian Finance without laying the accounts upon the table?

Sir CHARLES WOOD replied that he had made no such statement.

MILEAGE DUTIES ON STAGE CARRIAGES.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHITE said, he begged to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been directed to the figures in the Stage Carriages, &c. Return (No. 309), just presented to this House, particularly at pages 2 and 3, as showing that the recent Act, 26 & 27 *Vict.*, has afforded no relief from the grievous amount of Mileage Duties imposed on road conveyances carrying passengers at separate fares, in London and other large towns, in competition with Railway Trains and untaxed Steam Boats; and whether, as the population of large towns use to a very great extent Stage Carriages or Omnibuses, his consideration has been given to the justice of extending the provisions of the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* to every description of vehicle?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he had no reason to suppose that any advantage would be derived by large towns from the extension of the provisions of the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* There was no tendency in those towns to use vehicles carrying ouly a small number of passengers, but rather to establish large ones. The object of the Act was to accommodate small towns, villages, and minor railway stations, where the traffic was so small that it would not pay to establish large vehicles. With regard to the other portion of the hon. Gentleman's question, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) could only refer to what he stated when he made his last financial statement—namely, that it might be desirable to re-consider the taxes on locomotion with a view to their reduction or omission when the state of the revenue would permit it to be done with justice and propriety, otherwise it would set aside claims of a more pressing character. Of course it was not in his power to take measures this Session with reference to the subject.

THE SILVER COINAGE.—QUESTION.

Mr. J. C. EWART said, in the absence of the hon. Member for Dumfries (Mr. William Ewart), he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in the event of the contemplated issue of a new Silver Coinage, it is intended to adopt the proportion of nine-tenths fine and one-tenth alloy, in conformity with the usage of most European countries, and the recommendation of the International Statistical Congress?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he was not in a condition at present to give a very distinct answer to the question of the hon. Member. No proposal had been made or matured up to the present time for the issue of a new silver coinage, or the composition of that coinage. He understood that the Master of the Mint, who had great and deserved authority on all matters connected with his office, entertained certain views with respect to the best composition for silver coins, but he had not yet made any proposition to the Government on the subject.

RAILWAY TRAVELLING.

QUESTION.

Colonel GREVILLE said, he rose to ask the President of the Board of Trade, If he is prepared to take any steps with a view to prevent the doors of railway carriages being locked in future; and if his attention has been called to the additional peril incurred by passengers travelling on railways from the objectionable practice adopted on many lines of fixing a bar across the centre of the windows of railway carriages, whereby the egress of passengers in case of accidents is effectually prevented?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, in reply, that some years ago a circular was sent round to the railway companies, after a serious accident had taken place in France and loss of life had been caused by the circumstance that the doors of the carriages were locked. The circular asked the companies to take care that in future both doors should not be locked, and from the answers that were received it appeared that all the companies concurred in the necessity of having at least one door left open. It appeared that at the recent accident at Keynsham, on the Great Western Railway, both doors of some of the compartments were locked; but that he believed was the result of accident. Some of the carriages had been turned at the previous station, and the person whose duty it was to have unlocked what had been the off doors, but which had become the near doors, forgot to do so. He was also informed that the accident arose from the key having been dropped between the carriages and the platform just before the train started. As a rule, however, one door was always left open. With regard to the bars across the windows of the carriages, that arrangement was adopted partly in consequence of the Board of Trade, because some of the carriages were so broad that danger was likely to result in the narrow tunnels to passengers leaning out of the windows. The Metropolitan Railway had placed bars across the windows of their carriages, but of so weak a construction that the passengers could easily break them ; so that persons wishing to make their escape through the windows would be enabled to break them down without very great exertion.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH, adverting to the answer of the President of the Board of Trade, said, he wished to ask, whether the practice which he seemed to approve, of locking one door only of a railway carriage, would not allow the locked door to be uppermost in case of the overturn of the carriage in certain cases of accident ; and, if so, how the ready egress of the occupants from the carriage would be facilitated.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he could not answer the question. He was informed that the door locked was always the off door, otherwise persons might get out on that side and find themselves run over by the trains on the other line.

VACANT INSPECTORSHIP OF CHARITIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. FERRAND said, he rose to repeat the question which he had put on a former occasion as to the intention of the Government to fill up the office of Inspector of Charities, vacant by the death of Mr. J. Simons, jun.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, in reply, that the Commissioners of Charities had considered the subject, and had come to the conclusion that the present state of the business of the Office did not enable them to reduce the number of Inspectors. The noble Lord at the head of the Government had therefore appointed Mr. Good, who had been chief clerk of the Office for ten years, whose special knowledge of the business of the Commission and whose other qualifications justified the expectation that he would fill the office of Inspector of Charities with efficiency.

ANGLO-AUSTRIAN COMMERCIAL TREATY.—QUESTION.

Mr. BAINES said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any truth in the rumour that the negotiations for a new Anglo-Austrian Commercial Treaty has failed.

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that there was no truth whatever in the rumour. On the contrary, the Commission had been improved by the addition of new Members of the Austrian Government. The Commission had adjourned for the hot months, during which most people left Vienna, but they would meet again in September, and there was every prospect that their labours would be attended by a satisfactory result.

MALT DUTY BILL—[Bill 160.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. CAIRD said, that this Bill would, in his opinion, redress part of the just grievance of the barley growers, and he therefore supported it. He had declined to offer any opinion on the subject of the Malt Tax in the discussion on the Budget, as he entirely approved the remissions made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But the right hon. Gentleman, though he had since modified his language, spoke so strongly against the policy of any future reduction of the Malt Tax, that he felt desirous of presenting some points on the subject for his consideration. He held that a tax which impeded the growth of barley was injurious to the agriculture of this country. Of all corn crops, barley was the most friendly to the farmer. It was the shortest time in the ground, was the least exhaustive of the soil, was sown at the best season for cleaning and cultivating it, while it formed the best preparation for grass, and was the most suitable to follow green crops. Independent of its own value, barley farming thus promoted good husbandry, and the growth of those crops which were necessary for the production of meat, dairy produce, and wool. Now, the production of meat in this country was becoming every year a matter of increasing importance. Previous to the great development of trade and industry, the consequence of recent financial legislation, a large proportion of the working classes in the country could not afford to eat meat more than once a week. It would be a most moderate computation to say that a million of persons were so circumstanced, and when by better wages these persons were enabled to eat meat daily the increase of consumption so far became at once sixfold. Prices were thus rapidly rising, and larger demands were yearly being made upon the farmer for fat cattle and sheep. It had been said that a penny in the pound of income tax made a difference to the revenue of the country of a million and a quarter, but a penny a pound on the price of meat was equal to one million and a quarter sterling on the annual consumption of the metropolis alone, and if they took that of the United Kingdom they would find that the increase of every penny on the pound of butcher's meat would cost the people not less than ten millions sterling. The rise in the price of meat during the last ten or fifteen years was equal to twenty millions sterling per annum. Here was far more than an equivalent for the loss of the Malt Duty to the revenue. If, by a change in our mode of agriculture, we could to some extent, even if not to the full extent, meet the increasing demand for butcher's meat, we should be fully compensated. And we must reckon not only on the increasing appetite of the existing population, but on the demands from the increase of population. That went on at a rate which would absorb every three years the whole of the fat stock produced in Scotland. Foreign countries could not meet the demand. The imports of foreign stock seemed to have reached their maximum. The same causes were at work abroad as at home in producing an increased demand for butcher's meat. Increased wages everywhere were followed by increased consumption. Now, the substitution of barley for wheat in his course of crops would at once enable the farmer to increase his production of meat. In former times, under protective duties, wheat, from its comparatively high price, was unduly forced into culture. On clay land especially it was looked to exclusively, so much so that many farmers thought such land unsuited to barley. But the gradual rise in the price of barley, and the fall in that of wheat, had encouraged the growth of barley on clay soil, to the great advantage of the farmer and the more economical and better cultivation of his farm. The strong clays, which were formerly thought not fit for barley, would in fact produce heavier crops, though not of the finest malting qualities, than the best barley lands. In the neighbourhood of Herne Bay no less than ten quarters of barley per acre had last year been grown upon the stiffest of clay soils. Wheat required to be sown in the autumn; and it was obviously a great advantage where, as in the case of barley crops, the farmers could take a green crop, say of mangolds, off the land before it was wanted for sowing in the spring. He could plough and sow in better season, and might grow green crops in many instances, and thus feed sheep and cattle where, under the old wheat system, that was impossible. A barley farmer could scarcely be a bad farmer. His corn crop not only was less severe upon the land, but it was preceded and followed by green crops and grass, which restored fertility. He, therefore, maintained that it would be an immense advantage to British agriculture, and to the increased production of meat, dairy produce, and wool, if barley could, to a large extent, be substituted for wheat. He was quite aware of the fact that barley had risen in value more than any other kind of corn, and of the force of the argument which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had based upon that fact. From 1800 to 1850 one bushel of wheat was worth two of barley. Since 1850 barley had more nearly approached the price of wheat, and the moment barley became nearly equal to wheat in value it would be largely substituted as a crop for it. There was another reason: the farmer could grow a much larger crop of barley than of wheat on the same land. The amount would probably be from 5½ to 6 quarters of barley instead of 4 quarters of wheat, besides giving to the farmer greater facilities in the production of butchers' meat. It was no satisfactory answer to say that this advance in the price of barley had taken place under the disadvantages of a heavy exceptional tax. The owners and occupiers of clay land in this country needed all the fair play they could get. The fact that barley could, even with a heavy malt duty, be grown with more profit than wheat, was no reason for continuing an exceptional tax. Barley was the wine crop of this country. As the people became better off they took more of that which was the produce of it, and that was the reason that the price had risen more than that of any other crop. But it would rise still further, and be still more remunerative but for this heavy duty. Agriculturists did not ask any class advantage—any return to protective duties or legislative encouragements. They asked simply to be placed on the same footing as the hop grower, the potato grower, the coal-owner, or the ironmaster, that our raw produce should not be subjected to exceptional taxation. The farmers of the heavy clay lands especially deserved the sympathies of the Legislature. They wanted no protection; but what they did ask for, and this they had a right to demand, was that no exceptional taxation should be laid on the articles which they produced, the effect of which would be unfairly to limit their use. Though it was true, as recently remarked by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the price of barley had of late been enhanced more than other portions of the agriculturist's produce, the rise would have been still greater without the present burden on the cultivation. The right hon. Gentleman, in arguing the question on a former occasion, had referred——

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me point out to the hon. Gentleman that this is not a fitting occasion to reply to a speech made in a former debate and on another subject. This is not the continuance of a debate on the same Bill.

Mr. CAIRD said, he would avoid any reference to the former debate, and would confine his observations entirely to the effect of the Malt Tax upon the agriculture of the country. With regard to the argument of injustice to Scotland in the matter of the spirit duty, that had not been advanced by any Scotchman. The consumption of whisky in that country was decreasing, and that of beer steadily increasing. He was informed that the quantity of malt used in Edinburgh in brewing beer had risen from 32,000 quarters in 1854 to 150,000 quarters in 1864, and that from two causes—first, the increased price of spirits; and secondly, the improved quality of the beer. A change from raw spirits to beer was one which all wise men commended, and any policy which would tend that way would not be unjust to Scotland. One word with regard to the interests of the consumers of beer. In every country, except England, milk was much used as an article of food by the mass of the people. In Scotland, Ireland, on the Continent, and in North America milk was much used. But it could not be had by the people of this country, and every year milk was becoming more scarce and dear. Home-brewed ale was an excellent substitute. An hon. Friend of his, who had had much experience, told him that he never knew a bad or inefficient labourer who brewed his own beer. He had not the temptation of the beerhouse to spend his money, and take him away from his family. He must for these reasons venture to urge upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he should again have a surplus to dispose of—in the interest not only of the agriculturist, but of the consumer—the great advantage there would be in the removal of any impediment which the present malt duty might produce upon the extended cultivation of barley in this country, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give to the question of the repeal of this tax his most favourable consideration. A heavy tax on an article of home growth—the wine of the country—which in England drove the people to the public-house, and which impeded the best and most reproductive system of farming, could not but deserve the most careful consideration of the House.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he felt bound to express his great satisfaction that a Gentleman so eminently qualified to deal with the subject, and so familiar with it in all its details, should have directed his attention and that of the House to the bearing of the tax upon the agriculture of the country. There was another point in connection with the question, the importance of which could scarcely be overrated—namely, the effect of the Malt Tax upon the price of meat. All who had experience and had fairly and impartially considered that branch of the subject, were perfectly satisfied that it was one which bore upon the interest of the entire community, but more especially that portion of it who were unable to indulge more than once or twice in the week in the—to them—luxury of a single plateful of butcher's meat. The kindred Bill, for taking off the duty upon malt for feeding cattle, had been framed, he had no doubt, in an excellent spirit; but, unfortunately, it had been hampered by every sort of restriction and complication, and, moreover, had come before the House accompanied by the report of a gentleman of great experience, which went to show that the Bill would be almost entirely useless. He hoped, therefore, the time was approaching, and he believed it was, when the attention of Parliament would be directed to the distinct point whether this question of the repeal of the Malt Tax was not a labourer's question —a question concerning the interests of the lower and poorer classes of the community, rather than those of the agriculturists and the owners of land. With regard to the Bill before the House there was very little to be said on the one side or the other. It was well meant, he had no doubt, and in those periods which occasionally occurred, sometimes one or two years in succession, when from causes connected with the weather the greater quantity of the barley produced was light and inferior in character, the Bill would have the effect of giving considerable relief to the producers of barley and the manufacturers of malt by indirectly doing that which he and others had vainly called upon the right hon. Gentleman and the Government to do by a partial mitigation of the tax. He would also say, in passing, that the standard of 53lb. was wisely selected by the right hon. Gentleman both for the growers of barley and the manufacturers of malt. But here his commendation of the Bill must cease. He might, however, add, that it rather tended to create a faint and shadowy hope in the minds of those who had laboured for the repeal of the tax that in thus, without solicitation, framing this Bill, the right hon. Gentleman entertained some misgivings in his own mind and conscience as to the extent of the justice which he had meted out to the agriculturists and the consumers of beer. He feared, however, that it was a sentiment, he might almost say a principle, in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman that "the repeal of the Malt Tax would be the death warrant of indirect taxation." If that were so, if they had reason to fear that that principle had been adopted —not merely by a "prominent" Member, but by the most distinguished and potential Member of the present Government, they could not but apprehend that it was a principle which the Government, as long as they might be intrusted with power by that House, would endeavour to carry into effect. This was not a question in which the farmers were exclusively, or even mainly, concerned. It was one directly affecting the poorer classes of the community, and he once more reminded the House of the challenge he had offered to the right hon. Gentleman — namely, that if a Committee or a Commission were granted upon this subject he pledged himself to demonstrate that while the revenue derived only £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 a year from the malt duties, the sum paid by the beer consumers by reason of this tax was one-third of the entire price paid by them for beer. In the three kingdoms together this amounted to £60,000,000, and thus £20,000,000 per annum were paid by the consumers for every £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 which passed into the Exchequer. If such a Committee were granted, he would show besides that while the consumers of beer were taxed to the extent of 33 per cent, wine consumers were only taxed to the extent of 10 or 12 per cent, and tea, under the reduced duty, 25 per cent. Yet tea and wine were articles of foreign production, and wine was drunk only, or chiefly, by the wealthier classes. He hoped the time was come when those who stood forward as advocates of the interests of the labouring classes would remember, in addressing their constituents, to ask them whether they did not desire a remission of taxation in respect of the only article of luxury in which they could indulge, and which to them was almost one of the necessities of life. He hoped that the advocates of the repeal of the Malt Tax on the Government side of the House would hear upon the hustings that farmers' and labourers' true friends were not those who gave an isolated vote for the repeal of the Malt Tax, and then followed up that vote by a thick-and-thin support of a Government resolved that it should never be repealed. The tax on malt was, he repeated, not so much one on the farmer and producer as it was a tax affecting the working man. That the labouring classes should have to pay in taxation so great a proportion of the whole price of beer as one-third was inconsistent with the principles of free trade and destructive of every principle of taxation upon which this House had acted for the last twenty years. He was now ready to go into Committee upon this Bill. Small as was the boon conceded, he still welcomed it, and would regard it as an earnest of something more and better hereafter.

MR. PUGH said, he did not wish to criticize this Bill, or the other financial measures, which afforded a very considerable remission of taxation; but he would mention one point in which they had fallen short of his expectations, which were very moderate. Last year they had a Malt for Cattle Bill; and although it might not have been as widely operative as could have been wished, the good intentions which framed it were not the less apparent. This year he was in hopes that the right hon. Gentleman would have brought in a Malt for Man Bill, or a Malt for Home Consumption Bill, and that they would have had to thank the Chancellor of the Exchequer for a prospect of relief held out to the agriculturists in that direction. It would be said that the great brewers extended their operations everywhere, and that the days of cottage and home brewing had passed away. That was so, probably, in the immediate vicinity of towns; but there were very many rural districts where the concession of such a privilege would be highly appreciated. It was considered by the working men a hardship, that after rising early, late taking rest, and eating the bread of carefulness after laboriously tilling the soil "from morn to dewy eve," after superintending all the rural operations, from the introduction of the seed into the ground to its final germination in the year, an almost penal legislation intervened and prevented and intercepted them in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labour to which they were so well entitled. He believed that a measure such as this, far from increasing intoxication would, by withdrawing them from the public-houses, and by promoting more domestic habits, make a change in the opposite direction. The inhabitants of the vine-growing countries were generally considered the most sober; and it would be in accordance with the voice of nature. In every country and in every age it had been held to be the inalienable birthright of the tiller of the soil to gather its fruits free from the visits of the tax collector, and without even the intervention of the tradesman. The poets in the early ages told us—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer with his abundant scholarship could no doubt supply them with quotations without end—of the happiness of the hospitable old man, of whom it was said—

> "Dapibus mensas onerabat inemptis."

Indeed, the poets were never weary of painting the amiable picture—

> "Quod si pudica mulier in partem juvet
> Domum atque dulces liberos;
> Sacrum vetustis extruat lignis focum,
> Lassi sub adventum viri—"

And now they came to what would answer to the home-brewed—

> "Et horna dulci vina promens dolio,
> Dapes inemptas apparet"

—then he said his exultation would know no bounds. He was portraying the age of nature, and they could not improve on that. The greatest and most consummate artists always said, "Follow nature." Afterwards, as civilization advanced, wars commenced, and taxes were imposed as their natural result; but, unfortunately, when the wars ceased the taxes, which were their offspring, like the malt tax, remained, and some of them seemed to endure for ever. Of late years there had been a large remission of taxation pressing principally on the manufacturers, but in which the agriculturist, as a member of the community, had shared. He recognized no antagonism between those two great bodies. Their interests, in this country, at least, were inseparably united, their prosperities and adversities were ever the same. But he could not shut his eyes to the fact that the malt tax pressed rather exceptionally on the agriculturist. He had hoped that it would have been reserved to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have removed some part of this anomaly. He believed it was the right hon. Gentleman's ambition to be the Finance Minister, not only of a party, however great and powerful, but of the whole country, and his ardent admirers would willingly have seen him reviving old sympathies and old amities, and effecting a reconciliation with his former friends who once followed him with so much devotion. That should have been done before the dissolution, which cannot now be far off—

> "Neque enim plus septima ducitur æstas."

That opportunity had been for the moment omitted or forgone. The financial harvest had passed; the financial summer was ended; and they were not saved—

> "Invidisse Deos, patriis ut redditus aris
> Conjugium optatum, et pulchram Calydona
> videret!"

But he would not despair of him yet. He hoped the day would come when he would do something (for he could do it) either in this or in some other way, which should send a thrill of satisfaction and exultation through the honest and manly hearts of the agricultural constituencies of the Empire.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the speech of his hon. and learned Friend (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) bore the mark, as all his speeches did, of a most careful abstinence from the imputation of hostile motives and the most liberal appreciation of the efforts which had been made on the part of the Government to mitigate the inconvenience which attended the pressure of the Malt Tax. In the case of the Malt Feeding Bill it was said that the limited operation of that measure was owing to the cumbrous restrictions of the Excise and the disparaging Report which had been made by an officer of the Government. Now, he apprehended, that neither the maltsters nor any other traders were made of such materials as to be debarred from pursuing a profitable trade by any disparaging report. With respect to the statement that the restrictions of the Excise had impeded the operation of the measure, he could assert that not one single person conversant with the working of the Bill had expressed any such opinion. On the contrary, he had in his possession letters from numerous gentlemen testifying from their practical experience that the restrictions of the Excise had not impeded the operation of the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that a challenge which he had thrown out had not been accepted. Now, he could not admit the truth of that proposition; but he would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman of a challenge which he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had thrown out, but which had not been accepted. The hon. and learned Gentleman had undertaken to prove that the Malt Tax, which only produced £6,000,000, cost the consumers £20,000,000, and he likewise undertook to prove certain points with regard to the percentage of the taxation on malt. But the hon. and learned Gentleman forgot that the Government had afforded him all the facilities of proof he desired, and had offered him the re-appointment of a Committee which had sat on that subject. The non-renewal of that Committee was owing to the circumstance that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not do what the Committee itself had recommended—move for its re-appointment. The hon. and learned Gentleman therefore had not accepted the challenge which he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had thrown out. The hon. and learned Gentleman stated that the sum expended annually by the people of this country on beer was £60,000,000. What a deplorably oppressed trade that must be in which Englishmen were forbidden to invest to a greater extent than £60,000,000 annually, whilst, according to the best estimate that could be formed, the outlay for all other purposes—physical, material, political, moral, social, intellectual, spiritual—was £600,000,000; so that a full tithe only of the expenditure of the country found its way to that oppressed article! The hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that the present Government was formed on the principle of supporting the Malt Tax, and that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had asserted that "its repeal would be the death warrant of indirect taxation." Now what he did say was that the repeal of the Malt Tax without the imposition of some tax on beer would be the death warrant of all indirect taxation, and would be the most likely means of greatly disturbing the whole incidence of our financial system, and the relation of one of its parts to another, and he was bound to say that the present contentment of the country was connected with the maintenance of that system. But it was as far as possible from accuracy to say that on Her Majesty's Government rested the responsibility of maintaining the Malt Tax. Taxes were imposed to meet the expenditure of the country, and those were the true opponents of unnecessary taxation who endeavoured to promote the economical expenditure of the public money and that wise legislation which enlarged the public means. He would not dwell on the interesting speech of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Pugh), with all the refreshing recollections which it revived of the happy period when rural and domestic images were more familiar to our minds. The hon. Gentleman had laid down the principle not only that the beer of the people ought to be untaxed but unbought. The hon. Gentleman must mean that it should be taken from the stores of the brewers without compensation, or he must mean that the land should by some agrarian law be so distributed as that every man should grow his own portion of barley. Now, he did not think the pleasing vision of the hon. Gentleman could be realized. If the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) was so anxious for the reduction of the Malt Tax, he might have set about it in the present year. Why did he not set up his proposition against that of the Government for the reduction of the income tax and the duty on tea? The hon. and learned Gentleman represented a powerful party who were supposed to be unanimous in their desire to relieve the farmer from the crushing burdens to which he was subjected, and to put the repeal of the Malt Tax against the reduction of the income tax, and a considerable number of hon. Members on that (the Ministerial) side of the House were willing to maintain the income tax at sixpence, and if they had joined the hon. and learned Gentleman he would have been sure of having a majority. Now, if the Malt Tax was not repealed it was because the advocates of the repeal did not place it against the reduction of the income tax. It was useless to expect that the people of England would believe in the earnestness of the advocates of the reduction of a particular tax when they would not make themselves responsible for pitting the repeal of that tax against the repeal of another tax. What was the use of giving the farmer barren words, fine periods, prolonged debates, repeated Committees, and calling public meetings of the Central Malt Tax Repeal Association, when their Friends in Parliament declined to bring forward the question as a definite and practical reform?

MR. PUGH said, that he had not hinted at any agrarian law. All that he wanted was that the farmer should have unbought beer—unbought because home brewed.

MR. BARROW said, he did not share in any reproach which might be thrown by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the advocates of the repeal of the Malt Tax. He did not wish to place the reduction of the Income Tax and the Tea Duty in competition with the repeal of the Malt Duty.

MR. BASS said, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going a little too far when he said that indirect taxation would be utterly destroyed by the reduction of the Malt Duty, since all they asked for was that it might be reduced one-half.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he spoke of repeal and not reduction.

MR. BASS said, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no fear then as to the effect upon indirect taxation by merely reducing the Malt Duty, why did he not try the experiment by reducing the duty to one-half of the present amount. He wished also to observe that the present mode of levying the duty led to an excessive amount being paid. He was intimately acquainted with a house which had, during the last six months, paid £3,500 more than the Chancellor of the Exchequer was entitled to receive. As he was informed, all that was ever intended by the law was that the duty should be levied upon the dry barley steeped; but the maltsters now paid at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent more than they would be charged with upon that system. If the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) would assist in the reform of two or three apparently small matters like that, he would be doing something for his constituents. He could not altogether agree with the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Stirling (Mr. Caird), because he did not understand how meat was to be cheapened by increasing the price of barley from the strong lands. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would next year consider this question of the reduction of the Malt Duty, and would do something to give to the agricultural interest that relief to which it was so well entitled.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he gave the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer credit for having given a most important intimation. He had stated that the Malt Tax could not be repealed without the imposition of a tax on beer. It was most satisfactory to hear that the right hon. Gentleman had been considering the solution of the difficulty which existed, for a tax on beer would produce one-half of the tax upon malt. Although he had supported the Motion for the repeal of the Malt Tax, he gave the preference to the scheme proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and preferred the reduction of the Income Tax and the duties on Fire Insurance and tea. He drew from the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the augury that in a more favourable condition of the revenue the Malt Tax would be considered in the sense which he had pointed out.

MR. HENLEY said, that he regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not allowed this debate to pass without indulging in the taunt which he had directed against those who advocated the abolition of the Malt Tax. It would have been in better taste, and he was sure that it would have been truer, to have let it alone; because, what were the facts? Before the right hon. Gentleman's financial scheme was made known, but when it was understood that there would be a considerable surplus, a plain, straightforward Motion was made for the abolition of the whole or a part of the tax, and the right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that after the House had come to a definite decision upon that Resolution it would have been idle to oppose his proposals. Therefore the observations which the right hon. Gentleman had just made were entirely uncalled for, and were not calculated to conduce to the amicable transaction of the business of that House. The Bill before the House had attracted no attention whatever in his part of the country (Oxfordshire). He had heard nothing either good, bad, or indifferent about it, and therefore he should say nothing, but he must protest against the insinuation which the right hon. Gentleman had made that those who advocated the abolition of the Malt Duty did not act in good faith. [The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a gesture of dissent.] The right hon. Gentleman shook his head, but that was the meaning of his remark, that they addressed long speeches to anti-malt-tax associations, but made no attempt in that House to carry the repeal of the duty, because they preferred the abolition of other taxes. He, for one, took no part in the proceedings of anti-malt-tax associations, but he did not like to hear such insinuations, and must enter his protest against them.

MR. MALINS said, that in the borough which he represented (Wallingford) there was so much diversity of opinion with reference to the repeal of the Malt Tax that it became a question entirely for the private judgment of the Member. Now, although he voted for the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for East Suffolk (Sir FitzRoy Kelly), on account of the moderation of its terms, he pointed out to his constituents that the maintenance of the revenue was of more importance than the repeal of the Malt Duty. He, like every one else, approved the reduction of the income tax and of the duty on fire insurances; but he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not right in reducing the tea duty. Nobody expected such a reduction, and the surplus which he had in hand ought to have been devoted to a reduction of the Malt Duty, which was being loudly asked for by a large number of persons in and out of Parliament. As the agricultural interest had expressed so decided an opinion on the subject, and the right hon. Gentleman had not granted them a boon for a long time, he hoped that if the right hon. Gentleman had a surplus next year, he would avail himself of the opportunity of carrying into effect the Resolution which had been proposed by his hon. and learned Friend.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 6 were *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Mode of calculating Duty on Malt when charged according to Weight.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would now state what he thought to be the practical operation of this clause, which was the material and operative clause of the Bill. He was far from saying that the effect of this provision would be that which, in point of fact, was desirable—namely, to apportion the weight of the Malt Tax in every instance to the real malting value of the barley. There were malting qualities in different kinds of barley which this Bill would not touch, such as colour, skin, and the friable quality of the farine, which ingredients helped to determine the price. But one great quality ran through all barleys, which, other things being equal, was of great importance in determining their value, and that was weight. As far as weight was concerned, he hoped the Bill would have the effect of placing light barley on as fair and equitable footing, as far as the tax was concerned, as that in which heavy barleys stood. Most of the Amendments he proposed were verbal, but he had to propose an important one, and that was to fill up the blank in the clause with "53lb.," which was to be taken as the standard of weight. If they were to fix the pivot weight too high they would give no relief, and would diminish to a considerable extent the revenue from malt. He had endeavoured to ascertain from the best authorities what were those barleys which ought really to be considered light with reference to malting, and what should be the point of division between these and the heavy barleys. What they aimed at curing by the present Bill was the defect that the amount of the Malt Duty was made to depend on measure. The problem of the maltster was to get out of a given bulk as much malting power as he could. In order to do that he looked to the quality of the barley, and the better the barley the greater would be the amount of extract it would yield from a given bulk. The bulk of malting barley did not differ in any great degree, but the amount and value of the malt produced from them differed greatly though it was subjected to nearly the same tax. He believed that to a limited extent the better barley gave a greater bulk of malt than the lighter barley did. The difference in the value of this malting product of barley was what they sought to deal with in this Bill. If they took the parcels of barley equal in other respects, but differing in weight, when these parcels were malted the difference in bulk would be small, but the difference in value would be great. The lighter barley would give a malt of much less value than the heavy barley, and therefore he wished to put the holder of the lighter barley on a footing on which he would be less subjected to the disadvantages of the operation of the present law, and more on an equality with the holder of the best malting barley. The mode of effecting that object was this:—They took the standard of barley at 53lb., and he would show how it would operate in relation to light barley used for malt weighing, say 50lb., though he believed that some qualities of even lower weight were sometimes used for malting purposes. He would suppose a quarter of that malt put into the cistern to steep. The process would then go on precisely as at present, the only alteration being that the top of the cistern would have to be covered in such a way that though the process could be watched the barley could not be changed for a heavier barley. It was gauged then as now before it was taken out of the cistern to be put on the couch, and also after it was put into the couch. That was the period when it was supposed to have attained its greatest swell or bulk. He would suppose that it had swollen in that case from eight bushels to ten bushels. A process was then applied to rectify the increase—which was said to be insufficient. His hon. Friend (Mr. Bass) had referred to the case of a house which had been mulcted in the sum of £3,500 by an inaccuracy to the extent of 2½ per cent. The operations of that house could not in that case be inconsiderable. According to established rules, when the bulk reached 10 bushels an allowance was made of 18½ per cent, and that was reckoned decimally—namely, a reduction from 10 to 8·15, but as the practice was to strike off the second decimal figure the result was that 8·1, or 8 1-10th, was charged. That was the rule as it now stood. By the operation of the present Bill, what was done was that the bulk, or 8 1-10th, was multiplied by the weight of barley and divided by the standard weight, and the quotient, 7·6, would be the amount of barley to be charged for duty. This would be a relief of from 6 to 7 per cent, varying in proportion to the weight of the barley. He need not trouble the Committee with regard to the Bill, because it was admitted that as far as the regulations were concerned they were what they ought to be if the main feature of the Bill became law.

MR. BARROW said, he had been requested to urge upon the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of raising the average to fifty-four and not to fifty-three, if he meant to benefit the growers of barley on strong lands.

MR. BASS said, that would be to go too low, and the result would be to introduce the very poor foreign barleys. The figure of 53lb. was the full weight of the average of malting barley.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that various inquiries had been carefully made, and the weights not only went below fifty-three but also fifty-two and even fifty-one. The result of the alteration would be that foreign barleys would receive the main portion of the benefit of the Bill.

The figures "53" were then inserted.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 8 to 13 *agreed to.*

Clause 14 omitted.

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

SUGAR DUTIES AND DRAWBACKS BILL.

[BILL 198.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee,)

Clause 1 (Duties on Cane Juice.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the object of the Bill was to give effect to a treaty which had not yet been ratified, and therefore could not be presented to the House in the usual form by command of Her Majesty, but for the information of the House, as the treaty required legislation, a copy had been presented as a return from the Treasury. The treaty was an attempt to establish a practical equality as far as regarded sugar duties between four European countries, which among them comprised a very large share both of the import and consumption and the refining trade in sugar; namely, France, England, Belgium, and Holland. It was very well known that for a length of time it had been a matter of complaint in certain of these countries that the legislation of the other countries was so regulated in relation to duties and drawbacks as to operate unfairly upon them, and the refiners in particular in this country had loudly complained that a large bounty was practically granted to the refiners of sugar in Holland under the name and title of drawback. We believed in this country that our drawbacks were fairly adjusted to the duties paid by our refiners, but complaints were made against us in France and Holland that our drawbacks included in them the element of bounty. The French Government made to Her Majesty's Government a proposal three years ago that we should endeavour to arrive, on this great article of commerce which was the subject of so much exchange between the respective countries, at an uniform system. Her Majesty's Government, replied, that it would be impossible to think of inducing Parliament to enter upon any system of duty on sugar which should cripple or restrain the liberty of Parliament with regard to making that article a vehicle for its financial purposes; that they could not by any international convention agree to part with their liberty of raising or lowering the duty upon sugar; but still it was urged that what might be done was this, that our Government might agree to establish a certain relation between their duties on sugar and their drawbacks, which should come as near to absolute equality as science and experience could bring it, and that they could also undertake so to adjust the duties on sugar that if they did not think fit to make them uniform on all qualities of the article, yet the relative duties should be so accurately adjusted to the value for refining purposes that whatever the amount was, so long as that proportion was observed, it might move up and down so as not to interfere with the principle that all on sugar going out of the country should receive back neither more nor less than the duty it had paid on coming into the country. In pursuance of this view of the French Government, to which Her Majesty's Government acceded, they went into the matter, and the result was the treaty to which he had referred. With regard to the scale of duties on sugar that treaty provided that careful and elaborate experiments should be instituted on behalf of the four Powers in common, and subject to verification by the representatives of every one of those Powers. That was the mode by which it was proposed to fix the relative amount of duties to be levied on different classes of sugars; and so far as that part of the treaty was concerned, which was the most important part, the operation of the treaty would remain to be determined according to the result of those experiments when verified and accepted by Her Majesty's Government. But, in the meantime, the representatives of each of the Powers, in their examination of the present state of the law,became judges of the justice of the legislation of the other, and, of course, in each case of legislation three of the Powers might be considered to be impartial, and in some degree competent to pronounce on the legislation of the fourth. The effect of that was that various flaws were found in the scales of duties of the other Powers, and important boons would consequently be conferred on our refiners by the rectification which, under the treaty, would at once take place without waiting for the result of the experiments in the laws of the other contracting parties. But these contracting parties, when they came to be judges of our law, laid their finger on what they unanimously held to be two decided flaws. One was, that our drawbacks were too high, and contained the element of bounty; the other was, that in addition to our varying tax on sugar, to which in principle they did not object, and our separate duty on molasses, we had a duty on an article anomalous in character, being neither molasses nor sugar, namely, the article called milado, which was supposed to be a mixture in given proportions of sugar and molasses; and the representatives of the other Powers had made our concession of these two points an absolute condition of their acceding to the treaty. Her Majesty's Government had done what they could to ascertain how far they could proceed safely in this matter. There was no fiscal question involved; there was no question of competing claims between the Exchequer and the trade. The sole object was to make a convention which would tend to the enlargement and prosperity of this great trade. They found, as regarded the drawback, in which the refiners were principally interested, that there was a decided and general willingness to assent to the reduction proposed. They found that as regarded the duty on milado, what was demanded by the other Powers, was that they should abolish that as a separate duty, and raise it to the standard of the duty which they now levied on the lowest class of sugar. The arguments that were used by the other Powers in support of this course were two. One of them was that it would be manifestly almost impossible, by ordinary methods and experiment, to ascertain the actual constituents of milado. The second argument was that it therefore followed that there would be proportionate facility for fraud, by the introduction, under cover of that title, of quantities of sugar larger than ought to come in in proportion to any rate of duty fixed upon it. In the first place they were not able to deny the force of these arguments, and in the second place they had to deal with this state of things, that the representatives of the other Powers might say, "Accept these terms, or else we are not able to enter into this engagement." Therefore, the question was whether it was desirable in the interest of this trade to carry this treaty into effect. Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that it was. That was the proposal they now made. One or two words more. Let it be clearly understood that there was nothing in this convention to prevent Parliament from taking whatever steps it thought proper with regard to raising or lowering the duty, and there was nothing in the treaty to fetter their dealing as they thought fit with that part of the subject which was called refining in bond. That was a matter in respect to which great difficulties were apprehended, and he did not think that any mode of overcoming those difficulties had yet been discovered, but there was nothing in the international obligation that affected it. It had been represented to the Government that in altering this separate duty on milado some hardship would be inflicted on the owners of part of the article that was on its way or was in course of preparation for coming here, and they were disposed to think that there was some equity in those representations. They had consequently made a request to the other Powers, who entered into this convention, that the new duty on milado should not take effect immediately, but should take effect on and from the 1st September next.

MR. CRUM-EWING said, he approved the proposed convention generally, which would be exceedingly beneficial to the trade of the country; but he was exceedingly sorry that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not see his way to imposing a lower duty on cane juice. Some day the right hon. Gentleman, he hoped, would see his way clear to the only proper solution of this perplexing question of duties and drawbacks upon sugar, which was by allowing refining in bond. If the right hon. Gentleman gave the necessary directions, he believed the Customs Board would soon overcome the difficulties connected with the question, and he would thereby confer upon the community a greater boon than if he were to reduce the present sugar duty by one-half.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill reported without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

CONTROLLER OF THE EXCHEQUER AND PUBLIC AUDIT BILL.

[BILL 208.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, this was a limited and partial measure on a subject of considerable extent and importance. In 1857 a Committee of great weight was appointed to consider a subject of wide range, and was called the Committee on Public Moneys. This Committee recommended a large extension of the duties and powers of the Board of Audit. They added—

> "If these suggestions be adopted it will be necessary that the composition and relative position of this Board, as a great Department of State, should be re-considered by the executive Government. The Board of Audit is responsible to Parliament alone; and the station and emoluments of the person at the head of it should be equal in the importance of the duties to be performed, and not second in rank to any permanent officer presiding over our other principal Departments."

In the spirit of that recommendation the Government entirely concurred, and from time to time various steps had been taken with regard to the extension of the Department piecemeal; but there had not been yet any general re-construction, as it might be called, of the duties of the Department upon the broad principles which the Committee undoubtedly contemplated. Before the commencement of the present year it was made known to the Government that the late Chairman of the Board of Audit had definitely determined on applying for retirement, and his noble Friend (Viscount

Palmerston) was called upon to appoint a new Chairman to the Board. It then became the duty of the Government to consider whether the time was not arrived for taking measures for a general consideration of the subject of audit and of the functions and composition of the Board. The question then arose whether it was necessary to burden the public in increasing the emoluments of the officer at the head of the Board, and while the Government thought such an increase necessary, they also thought they saw their way clear to that arrangement without increasing, and, indeed, with a diminution of public burdens. Their proposal was to unite the functions of the head of the Board of Audit with those of the Controller of the Exchequer in the same person. They were of opinion that the combination of those offices would have many advantages besides the mere substitution of one salary for two. The Controller of the Exchequer was at the head of an ancient office, and exercised duties very various in their character and dignity. He had the custody of the standards of weights and measures, a duty entirely inconsistent with and unsustained by any of the analogies af the Department; and better provision could be made for the performance of that duty. The Controller of the Exchequer used to be the manufacturer every year, and, indeed, twice a year of the new sets of Exchequer bills which it was formerly the custom to renew annually. The superintending the manufacture of these bills and affixing the signature to them was one of the more considerable duties of the office. But some years ago an Act was passed providing that these bills should only be renewed once in five years. The financial engagements and the arrangements connected with them varied from year to year and from six months to six months; but the Bill itself was only renewable once in five years. At the time this Act passed it was distinctly in the contemplation of the Government, and, he might say, of Parliament, that the manufacture of those bills should be carried over from the Exchequer to the Bank; for it was provided in the Act that the remuneration given to the Bank for the payment of Exchequer bills should include any charges connected with the renewal of the bills. There were several other functions of the Controller of the Exchequer with which it was not necessary to trouble the House, but the function of the greatest importance and dignity was that called the Exchequr Control. It was the duty of the Controller of the Exchequer to note all the issues of public money that were authorized to take place under warrants from the Treasury, and to see that those issues were within the amounts voted by Parliament. This was a duty entailing very little labour, occupying very little time, and far from demanding or justifying the maintenance of a separate establishment. The office was invested with dignity and with considerable emolument, was of the very highest station in the permanent Civil Service, and comprised functions which required entire independence of the Executive Government. The headship of the Board of Audit was a very responsible office, and one involving duties of much greater amount than the Controllership of the Exchequer; but there was nothing in the duties of either which would render their combination in the hands of the same person in the slightest degree inconvenient. By this union the station of the head of the Board of Audit would be elevated, the independence of the Controller of the Exchequer would be maintained, and the charge to the public would be reduced. The present Controller of the Exchequer, well known to the Members of this House as a very distinguished person, and as an old public servant, was disposed to retire, and it was the intention of his noble Friend at the head of the Government to advise the grant to Lord Monteagle of one of the pensions now in abeyance, and due to him for political services in two of the offices he formerly held as Secretary of State for the Colonies and Chancellor of the Exchequer. During the life of Lord Monteagle, therefore, an increased public charge of £500 a year would result from the new arrangement; but this would be only an individual tenure. The consolidation of the two offices would effect a prospective economy, and this would not be the sole advantage of the arrangement. There was a great and obvious advantage in obtaining from Parliament authority to place at the head of the two offices one and the same person, who would give his assistance in making those arrangements with respect to the filling up of vacancies in the Audit Office which would be most economical to the public. He did not say that in point of law the Government would not be able to combine the two offices in a single person without coming to Parliament; but he was afraid that the person appointed would in such case be entitled to draw the salary of each office separately, and that was not a state of things which the Government desired. The Audit Office was at present large, and might, with an extension of duties, probably become larger; and it would be advantageous to be enabled to effect these combinations during the present Parliament. Power was taken under the Bill to make one appointment to the office of Controller General, and to make provision for the duties of the Assistant Controller, who, in fact, simply acted as the substitute of the Controller during his necessary absence. With regard to the officers of the Department, provision would be made in that considerate manner which was usual in regard to arrangements of this kind. One of them, he took occasion to mention, was a Gentleman of great merit, Mr. Chisholm, the head of the establishment of the Exchequer, than whom no more competent person was to be found in the whole Civil Service, and it was to be hoped the country would long continue to have the benefit of his valuable services. By the third clause the salary of the Controller was fixed. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) thought he had shown sufficient cause why the appointment should not be postponed, it being understood that the present legislation would not interfere with the reconsideration of the subject of duties. He was anxious to obtain from the House liberty and sanction for objects which were strictly of a practical character, and which involved the public economy, and, he believed, the principles of good legislation. It had occurred to him that possibly it might be the feeling of the House to confine the measure to making some provision for the present, and not to legislate at once for the whole of the future. In that case he would have no objection to alter a few words in the Bill to give effect to that desire. He moved the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, that any one might suppose from the state of the House, and from the period of the Session at which the Bill was brought forward, that it was a matter of petty detail or official routine, whereas it was a measure for the abrogation of one of the most ancient and honourable offices in the Kingdom. The office of the Exchequer dated from the Norman Conquest; its birth was coeval with the birth of the Kingdom of England. Yet the end of this Bill, if passed, would be that this ancient institution would be utterly swept away. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not now persevere with a measure of such magnitude. If this were a common Session, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had waited until the 15th of June to introduce such a Bill, we should hold that he had not dealt fairly with the House, nor with those Members who had been driven, by weariness and lassitude, to seek repose and solace at their country seats. But this is not the close of a usual Session. This Bill has been thrust before a moribund Parliament now panting at its last gasp. So many Members had left town, so many had gone down to their constituents to solicit support at the approaching general election, and were already canvassing through the country, that the Government had the greatest difficulty in keeping a House for their own business. It was counted out last Friday during the Committee of Supply. Was it, then, fair or decorous in the right hon. Gentleman now to introduce a matter of such stupendous magnitude and paramount importance? He desired not to oppose the principle of the Bill, but to have the subject amply and deliberately discussed. The arguments in favour of it should be carefully weighed; those against it should be thoroughly investigated; they should then balance them and arrive at a mature, a sound, and permanent conclusion on the whole question. Any decision they could now arrive at, in this superficial and hasty manner, would not have weight with the country, and would be scorned and tossed aside by a new Parliament. This was not a matter of great urgency, and as Lord Monteagle had not yet resigned, he did not see why there should be such haste. Why not wait for three little months until the meeting of the new Parliament? What loss could accrue to the country? What damage would thereby be caused to public business? Would the accounts be thereby thrown into confusion? Would the revenue of the country be diminished by postponing this measure? More was to be feared from hasty legislation than from prudent delay. This measure had been hustled up to its present position. It was introduced on Monday night without explanation; it was printed and delivered yesterday; and they were asked to affirm the principle to-day. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the Bill was brought in to effect a saving, but at the end of his speech he destroyed his own argument by stating that it would cause an additional expenditure of £500 a year. Supposing, however, that it would make a saving, the House should consider whether, while saving a paltry sum of £2,000 on the one hand, there might not be a loss of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 sterling on the other. Nay, more; they must remember that they lost far more than money could represent in sweeping away an ancient institution, if they thereby caused a violation of constitutional practice by freeing the Minister from the check and control which existed at present. Every man sought to increase his power. Ministers were no exception to the common condition of humanity. They very naturally kicked at every instance of control, and endeavoured to disburden themselves from every check. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that it would be inconvenient if the Bill did not pass, because, in the event of Lord Monteagle's death, a new appointment must be made, and that this appointment must be for life. This, therefore (he would have us believe), must postpone *sine die* the proposed reforms in our financial laws. But the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that, by the 3rd clause of the Exchequer Act, the appointment was always made subject to abolition or regulation by Parliament. This argument *ab inconveniente* had therefore no force. The principle of this Bill was to unite the offices and combine the functions of the Controller of the Exchequer and of the Chairman of the Board of Audit. Before the House could come to a judgment on the principle of the Bill, it was necessary to define clearly what were the functions of the Controller of the Exchequer, and what were the functions of the Commissioners of Audit. And if the functions of those officers were, as he maintained they were, inconsistent and incompatible, they could not be so hastily combined. It had been represented that the function of the Controller of the Exchequer was to watch the appropriation of the money voted by that House. This had been so often repeated, so frequently whispered, that it came at last to be regarded as a fact, and received as an indisputable truth. Then those who were anxious to abolish the Exchequer pointed out that the Controller could not really perform that function. But the fact was that the Controller had nothing to do with appropriation; his duty was to watch over the issues. He (Lord Robert Montagu) distinctly denied that the Controller of the Exchequer was ever intended to follow money to its appropriation; he asserted that it had been devised as a check over issues; and the Exchequer had not failed of performing its function. That that was the case was explicitly stated in the Report of the Committee on Public Moneys, which sat in 1856 and 1857, and of the Commission which preceded it. The Commissioners of Public Accounts reported in 1831 that the functions of the Exchequer consisted in—

> "(1.) That of the receipt and safe custody of the public treasure. (2.) That of control over the Crown and its Ministers. (3.) That of record."

In all this there is not a word of appropriation. How, then, could it be argued that because the Exchequer was no check on appropriation, it was therefore a useless office, and failed of its intention? Lord Monteagle, before the Committee of Public Moneys, was asked—

> "(605.) Do you consider it as a part of the functions of the Controller of the Exchequer to see that the Paymaster in any way makes a proper use of the money when once paid to him?—Certainly not; when withdrawn from the Exchequer account I have no such authority."

The Controller of the Exchequer, therefore, distinctly repudiates such a function as that which some had ignorantly or designedly endeavoured to saddle upon him. Mr. Anderson, the Chief Clerk of the Treasury, admitted to the same Committee—

> "(1034.) The Exchequer can have no control over the final appropriation of the public money."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire, who was examining him, then said—

> "(1035.) I am not inquiring about the final appropriation of the public money; be so good as to confine yourself to the issue of money into the hands of the man who has to appropriate it. Do you consider the control now exercised by the Exchequer a sufficient check for that issue?—It is the utmost that you can have."

It had been said, also, that that check was unreal and a mere fiction. That cry had not been echoed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He doubtless repudiated such an assertion, and refrained from using it in argument. It would have been very inconsistent if he had done so. For if the function of the Controller of the Exchequer is an unreality, why transfer it to the Board of Audit? Why insult them by imposing upon them a fiction? Why delude the nation in thinking that a check was maintained in their behalf when no control existed? Why make the Board of Audit lend themselves to this hallucination? But it might be granted that the check was not often required: but that was no argument against its maintenance. Three-deckers were not often wanted, yet they were built and maintained. The fortifications in England which were now being constructed at great cost, might never be used, and yet we paid large sums for building them. It was a fallacy, therefore, to say that because the check was not often called into exercise, it was therefore inoperative and useless. Its fallacy was proved by the Report of the Public Moneys Committee. In the Appendix, there was a list of about 200 cases in which the Controller of the Exchequer had exercised a real authority over Ministers of the Crown. Among other payments which that officer had prevented was one of £90,000 which the Treasury had endeavoured to draw out of the Consolidated Fund. To this the Controller objected; his objection was valid; the Treasury had to give way. At another time the Treasury attempted to draw out of the Consolidated Fund a sum in excess of the salary of the Lord High Chancellor. This again the Controller prevented, and saved that sum to the country. At another time the Treasury wanted to draw out of the Consolidated Fund the amount of the pension of a man who was dead. This was also effectually resisted and prevented by the Controller. The fact was that the Controller of the Exchequer exercised a real and very important control over issues. First, there was the check which he exercised over the issue from the Consolidated Fund of salaries and moneys drawn under Acts of Parliament; secondly, he prevented more money being issued from the Exchequer than the gross total of the annual Votes; and, thirdly, he permitted no money to be issued until the Appropriation Bill had been passed. If the Exchequer were abolished, which would be the ultimate effect of this Bill, money might be employed by the Treasury without the sanction of Parliament at all. Money might be drawn out of the Exchequer without assembling the House to vote it. The same might occur in this country which was now passing in Prussia. The contest of the 17th century in this country might again be renewed. The only two Acts which rendered it absolutely necessary that Parliament should meet every year were the Mutiny Act and and the Appropriation Act; because, by the expiration of the former Act, the army was dissolved at the end of the year, and the Controller of the Exchequer would allow no money to be issued until the latter Act had been passed. Until the last two or three years no one troubled themselves about the Mutiny Bill. The Appropriation Bill had likewise been gradually ground down and attenuated; but the check had been restored to it within the last three years, and it was saved for a time. What now were the functions of the Board of Audit? The functions of the Board of Audit were entirely different from those which he had described as belonging to the Controller of the Exchequer. It was a detective society; it could not interfere with the action of the Government—it could not arrest Ministers in a course of misappropriation—it could in no way fetter the action of the Executive. Its business was to discover, not prevent, misappropriation. It had to search and investigate, and if it discovered that money had been misappropriated it could only report the circumstance to Parliament, and leave Parliament to deal with the Administration as they thought proper. By this Bill the functions of the Board of Audit would be entirely changed, and it would fetter the action of the Government and receive authority over issues with which the Commissioners of Audit had now nothing to do. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER shook his head.] Then, the effect would be to substitute for the existing two checks—the one operating before the issue of the money, and the other afterwards—the merely one-sided check of the Board of Audit. You abandon all control over the issues before expenditure, and trust alone to the Appropriation check which comes into operation after the money has been spent and the accounts rendered. That that check was practically very slight was proved by the circumstance that, although the Board of Audit had reported that the Board of Works had misappropriated £176,000, not a word had been said about the matter in that House. The Board of Audit reported the misappropriation of an enormous sum, and yet the Minister had not been called to account for it by the House. Hence the check was not very severe. But if they were to trust to this subsequent check alone, then it should be made co-extensive with the present check of the Exchequer. It should be extended to all the accounts; it was wrong to leave some accounts free from all check or control whatsoever. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had rehearsed a portion of the Report of the Committee of Public Moneys, wherein they recommended that the powers of the Board of Audit should be extended, that the rank of the chairman should be exalted, and that he should receive an increased salary, and should be made independent of Ministers, and amenable to the House of Commons alone. That portion of the Report was familiar to him (Lord Robert Montagu), for he had adopted it in 1862 as the substance of a Motion which had been opposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That matter was now not touched by the Bill before the House. But before those important functions were conferred upon the Board of Audit it must be dealt with. The Board now audited a few accounts, but they ought to audit all. Then it would be possible to make some requisite changes in the Exchequer. Every witness who testified in favour of a change in the office of the Exchequer in 1856 and 1857 had put this forward as the necessary prelude. This formed the basis of Sir George Lewis's famous memorandum. He recommended some changes in the Exchequer, preceded, however, by the extension of the sphere and powers of the Audit Board. In the year 1860 there was a Motion carried by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Portsmouth (Sir Francis Baring), which went the length of saying that all accounts should be audited by the Commissioners of Audit. That had not been done, and yet the House was now invited to alter the constitution of the Exchequer. The Committee on Public Accounts in 1861 had again entreated and urged the Government to extend the sphere of the Board of Audit. But all had been in vain. He had referred to a clause in the Act which said that the Controller of the Exchequer should hold no other office, and there was another clause which decreed that Exchequer Bills should be prepared only by that officer. Exchequer Bills were, in fact, a creation of public debt. They were securities transferable from hand to hand, like bank notes, and payable to bearer. If this Bill passed, who would draw Exchequer Bills in future? Was it to be the Audit Office? It was not consistent with their proper functions to increase at pleasure the amount of the public debt. Was it to be the Treasury? What, then, would prevent them from issuing Exchequer Bills beyond the amount authorized by Parliament? Was it to be left entirely in their hands to increase the Public Debt, without check or control? That the Commissioners of Accounts of 1831 regarded this as a real danger is proved by the following passage in their Report:—

> "To prevent the issue of any Exchequer Bills beyond the amount authorized by Parliament, it should be provided that every such Bill be countersigned at the Exchequer before it can obtain a legal currency."

And yet, in defiance of all these recommendations, the Exchequer Office was to be swept away. There were anomalies which this Bill would not touch. According to the present law the Controller only allowed money to issue for the use of certain specified services, and in his warrant he declared that the money so issued should be applied to those particular services, and to no others. The Paymaster was strictly forbidden to apply the money drawn for one purpose to any other purposes. Nevertheless, as soon as he received the various sums, he threw them all into one drawing account and one balance, and applied the whole indiscriminately for all the services. He did not deny that there might be a necessity for such a proceeding, but certainly it was illegal, and any Bill professing to deal with this subject should deal with anomalies such as that. Many remedies had been suggested. One was that instead of having one Paymaster, there should be an accountant for each service, who should draw what was required for that service, and keep a balance for that service alone. A great injury would thus result. The total of all the balances in the hands of this multitude of Paymasters would amount to far more than the balance which lies idle in the hands of a single Paymaster. The difference between these sums did not now lie idle, but was used in reducing Deficiency Bills. He admitted that something ought to be done, but he doubted whether this was the right time for doing it. A far better course would be to wait three months, when a new Parliament would consider the whole subject of the constitution of the Board of Audit and its duties. The whole Exchequer question could be simultaneously debated; and then, after careful consideration, a sound, a definite, and a permanent arrangement could be effected. Impressed with that belief, he should move that the second reading of the Bill be deferred for three months.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he seconded the Motion. In one respect the Chancellor of the Exchequer had fallen into an error. The right hon. Gentleman had rightly said that the present office of Controller of the Exchequer included very heterogeneous matters, but the union of that office with the Chairmanship of the Board of Audit would entail duties very litte homogeneous. It must be an anomaly to unite in one person the duties of exercising control over issues and of presiding over a body which performed the duties of audit. Lord Monteagle, in his evidence, had stated that the most important manner in which the Controller of the Exchequer acted was when he acted by way of prevention, and the knowledge of the existence of that check prevented any necessity for the use of it. If there was not some control there would be great confusion in the appropriation of the sums voted by Parliament. He understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that the office of the Chairman of the Board of Audit was held *quam diu se bene gesserit.* What was the effect of such a tenure? Some said it meant that a man was to hold his office as long as he had good health; but he took it that an appointment *quam diu se bene gesserit* continued as long as the holder of the office behaved himself properly, was guilty of no misconduct, and was under no incapacity; that it was an office to be held for life. An hon. Member near him (Sir David Dundas) said, there must be some conviction against such an office before he could be removed; but perhaps the Attorney General would enlighten them on that point. His own belief was that the tenure *quam diu se bene gesserit* was not quite so secure a tenure as the hon. Member near him supposed. He thought a writ of *supersedeas* might still issue, and that it must be granted upon some cause stated in the writ, and then the Minister would be responsible to Parliament for the justice of that cause; but he did not understand it to be the law that a writ of *supersedeas* would not issue except upon a conviction. He wished to know whether the tenure of the office of Chairman of the Board of Audit was not less secure than that of the office of the Controller of the Exchequer, who could not be removed except upon an address from both Houses of Parliament; because, if that was so, and if they happened to have an unprincipled Government which wanted to remove a man, it might find out something against him, so that the office would not be as positively secure as a freehold office. These were important points, which he would like to have cleared up before they passed that Bill. If they joined to an office known to the Constitution, and having a permanent tenure, another office the tenure of which wos not so permanent, they went in the teeth, if not of the letter, at least of the spirit, of the third clause in the Exchequer Act, the object of which was not only to make the Controller of the Exchequer irremovable, but to prevent him from holding any other office not equally permanent. He thought it highly undesirable that the Controller of the Exchequer should hold any other office at all; because, although the duties of the Controllership might not be numerous, the post was one of such responsibility as to require the entire attention of one man. Another point which he desired to have cleared up in connection with that Bill was—Did the measure positively unite the office of the Controller of the Exchequer and that of the Chairman of the Board of Audit, and make them so closely associated that the Government of the day could never confer the office of Controller of the Exchequer on any one except the Chairman of the Board of Audit, and *vice versâ?* A small saving to the public from the amalgamation of these offices would be a very poor compensation for the evil of fusing into one office functions which, if not absolutely incompatible, were very inconsistent and heterogeneous, and the union of which would *pro tanto* affect the dignity, independence, and the insulated position, as it were, of an officer who was the guardian and custodian of the public money, and had in fact to see that the Votes of that House were properly and rigidly carried into effect.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Lord Robert Montagu.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir FRANCIS BARING said, he could assure the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) that there was no truth whatever in the reports to which he had referred in respect to this question. He wished that that Bill had been brought forward when there was a better opportunity for its discussion. It was a short Bill, but it dealt with a matter of far greater moment than the mere saving of a small sum of money by a union of these offices. He had long been of opinion that the office of the Controller of the Exchequer and the Audit Office required some revision. The office of the Controller of the Exchequer was originally a very important one, but it had now become very inefficient. Everybody who went through the evidence taken by the Public Moneys Committee would be satisfied that the check which that officer exercised in former times was now gone. It was very desirable that check should be revived. He used to issue his warrant to each particular department, the Army, the Navy, or the Ordnance, and the Treasurer of those Departments could not expend money upon anything not connected with his own service. Some new arrangement was needed, and it was of the utmost importance that the Audit Office should be strengthened. In the Report, which had been referred to, the late Sir James Graham had declared that in his opinion the Audit Office required strengthening; and every examination which he (Sir Francis Baring) had made when he was on the Committee of Public Accounts satisfied him that the Audit Office was one of the greatest importance, and ought to be strengthened. Sir James Graham proposed a plan by which the two offices might be consolidated, but it was not adopted by the Committee. He had no hesitation in saying that he preferred two separate offices, because he thought their union might be found to be attended with much danger. A contrary opinion, however, was entertained by so many gentlemen whose position entitled their views upon the subject to respect that he had not such confidence in his own opinion as to lead him to oppose what might ultimately be regarded as the wisest course to pursue. He had no objection to the Bill if it were to be regarded as a temporary measure only, and he saw no reason why it should not be so altered in Committee as to render it purely temporary in its character. The House should be careful how they gave their sanction to the principle of the abolition of the office of the Controller of the Exchequer without previous inquiry, and he thought it would be better to provide for a temporary arrangement than for the present Parliament to sanction the union of the two offices once for all. He was particularly desirous that no remark of his might appear to cast any reflection upon the Treasury or any of the heads of that Department, because a great deal had been done of late years in the improvement of the public accounts, and that improvement had more especially been visible during the period in which the right hon. Gentleman had held office. He hoped, therefore, that some arrangement might be made to drop some part of the Bill, or that the right hon. Gentleman would give the House an assurance that Parliament itself should be called upon at some future time to deal definitely with the subject.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he could not refrain from expressing his regret that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in introducing this measure, should have laid so much stress upon the small saving which would ultimately accrue from the amalgamation of these two offices, because the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman had, he feared, conveyed the impression to some hon. Gentlemen who had taken part in the debate that the Bill had been introduced for the purpose of effecting a saving of one or two thousand pounds a year. If that were so it was a strong reason for not proceeding further with it. It seemed to him, however, there was a more important object to be obtained by the measure. To some extent he differed from the right hon. Baronet the Member for Portsmouth (Sir Francis Baring), and he was in favour of what he understood to be the principle of the Bill. The real subject for consideration was what should be the arrangement for securing the right appropriation of public money. They had at present three offices—the Treasury, the Exchequer, and the Audit Office, with certain functions divided between them, those functions being derived from very ancient times. As those functions, however, had of late years from the condition of affairs, become greatly changed, he thought it was advisable that their position should now be revised. It was especially worthy the consideration of the House whether there any longer existed any real necessity for keeping up the department of the Exchequer at all. If, as he inferred, the object of the Bill was to put an end to the control of the Exchequer as a distinct office of the estate, while, individually, he was willing to consent to such a course he felt scrupulous at adopting, at the present stage of the present Parliament, a measure contemplating such an object. The question was one of great importance, and one upon which, as they could perceive, different opinions were entertained by high authorities. The final settlement of such a question ought therefore, in his opinion, to be left to the consideration of a new Parliament, where it would receive better attention than it could possibly do under the present circumstances. If they looked for a moment at the real question between Parliament and the Government, they would see that Parliament granted to the Government certain sums of money for executive purposes, and that Parliament possessed two pieces of machinery—the Exchequer and the Audit Office, intended for the control of the Government in the expenditure of the money which had been placed in its hands. The consideration and adjustment of any changes in these modes of controlling the expenditure of the Government was a matter, therefore, of great importance, and one with which the present Parliament was scarcely in a position to deal satisfactorily. Out of respect to Parliament these changes should be produced at a time when in a full House they could be fairly and fully considered. Another objection to their proceeding with this Bill, as a final measure, was, that in the system of these two offices it was desirable to introduce a variety of improvements. It was, no doubt, true, that a good many improvements had already been introduced, and that this had especially been the case with regard to the Audit Office; but the passing of this measure would lessen those inducements which at present existed for proceeding with the improvement of the system generally. He should wish to see introduced, at the earliest possible moment after the sitting of the new Parliament, a measure containing provisions not merely for the re-construction of the Exchequer, and, if necessary, of the Audit Office, but also for dealing with those questions affecting the superintendence of the appropriation of public moneys which required solution. That being his feeling, he still thought it would be unfortunate if they rejected the Bill, and he could not, therefore, support the Amendment of his noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu), because he felt that, if a vacancy were to occur during the recess in the office of the Controller General, without any alteration having been made in the law, it would be the duty of the Government to appoint a new Controller of the Exchequer, and such an appointment would create new difficulties and increased expenditure in the final settlement of this question in case the abolition of the office were deemed necessary. He thought, therefore, that as the matter now stood it would be desirable to frame such a provision as would meet the contingency which would arise from such a vacancy. He might, he believed, say that such a vacancy had already arisen, and for his own part he should not at all object to an arrangement by which the present Chairman of the Board of Audit should be appointed to the office of Controller General in conjunction with the office which he at present held, and that a proper addition should be made to his present salary, but he objected to their deciding at once that such should be the course proposed on all future occasions. He should like, therefore, to see some proviso annexed to the third clause to the effect that any person holding the office should hold it subject to any arrangement with regard to salary or duties which Parliament might hereafter determine upon. His object, in suggesting the insertion of such a proviso, was a desire that the hands of Parliament should not be fettered in the future discussion and settlement of the question. Another alteration which he thought he was fairly entitled to ask for in the Bill was the omission of the second clause. He could not see the necessity for introducing such a clause. It was prejudging the question, although he was rather prepared to go in the same direction; but it would be more respectful to Parliament to omit it from the Bill. He would therefore support the second reading of the Bill; but, unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer suggested some other mode of accomplishing the object, he should propose the alterations to which he had referred. This was a matter of really very great importance. It had been for a long time under consideration, and although he was anxious to see it settled it would be a great pity to hurry it at the last. At the present time the attention of the public had been called to the defects of our system of audit. The question was also being considered by a Committee upstairs on the public accounts. They ought to deal with the Exchequer and Audit Office in a way which would satisfy the public that every reasonable precaution was taken for preventing the misappropriation of public money and other frauds and irregularities, and to settle the relations between the three great departments—the Treasury, the Exchequer, and the Audit Office—on a much more satisfactory footing than at present. His noble Friend had stated his views with great ability, but he disagreed with him to a great extent in some parts of his speech, and he appealed to him whether it would be worth while to press his Amendment to a division. It would be better to make the necessary alterations in Committee and to leave the matter to be discussed more fully in another Parliament.

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR said, he hoped they would have a very distinct explanation of the views and intentions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the suggestions made by his hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) before his noble Friend consented not to press his Amendment to a division. The functions of the Audit Board and the Exchequer were different. The duty of the one was to look into the accounts, that of the other was to be a positive and absolute check. In matters of finance, he had always found that the last thing they should give up was any salutory check. After what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Francis Baring) who had taken so much pains, and had so much experience in this matter, he hoped his noble Friend would press his Amendment unless they received a satisfactory answer from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. HENLEY said, he thought the question whether the offices of Chairman of the Board of Audit and Controller of the Exchequer could well be held by one individual a matter of much less consequence than whether, according to the impression he, in common with his hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote), derived from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech, it was meant to do away with the Controller. That was a most important question. No doubt one man might hold both these offices as head; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer, throwing out as he did that the abolition of the office of Controller would be done with that tenderness always exhibited in these matters, it was pretty clear that it must be meant to do away with that office altogether. If the functions of the office regarding the present control over public moneys were still to be performed, there must be a staff for each office to assist the holder, whether he held one or two offices, to do that duty. Now, the office of Controller of the Exchequer was to prevent improper issues of public money. It was perfectly true that the Audit Office might discover a year or two afterwards that such issues had taken place, but it would then be too late. The moneys would have gone out of the Exchequer, and once gone it would be like trying to catch hold of an eel. They might blame individuals, but the money was lost. Although quite disposed to give full credit to the Lords of the Treasury, the Controller of the Exchequer was a constitutional officer, placed between them and Parliament to see that moneys directed by Parliament to go in a particular direction should go in that direction only; and he must say what he saw in the Public Moneys Committee had convinced him that considerable value belonged to the functions of the Controller. Some of the officers of the Treasury, in giving evidence, showed that the office gave them a little trouble. It made them look to their P's and Q's. They did not like it, and evidently wanted to get rid of it. They might again fall on bad times; and he should be sorry to see this wholesome check abolished. No public advantage would be gained by doing away with it. His hon. Friend below (Sir Stafford Northcote) had suggested what was not an unreasonable course. The question had been brought before them so suddenly, the Bill being only circulated yesterday, that some reasonable time should be given for its consideration, and he should be quite content if the Chancellor of the Exchequer adopted the course suggested by his hon. Friend. He hoped he would not drive them to oppose the second reading of the Bill by persisting in portions of it, which, after the statement of the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Francis Baring), should be expunged.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, a great portion of this debate had arisen from the importation into it of what he had endeavoured to exclude —that it was the design of the Bill to abolish those duties which were now performed by the Controller of the Exchequer. That had been assumed by the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu), by his hon. Friend opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote), and by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Francis Baring). Now, he had stated, as clearly as he could, that that was not the intention of the Bill. He said in express terms that all the duties of the Controller of the Exchequer should continue to be performed precisely as they were now performed, until Parliament had had the opportunity of considering the question. He had asked for power to prevent the necessity of maintaining offices useless to the country, due provision being made for the performance of necessary duties. But of all classes of men politicians were by far the most suspicious; they sometimes, however, outwitted themselves, and fell into error by their over suspicion and determination to see motives which did not exist. He did not say a word in disparagement of Exchequer control; but if he were asked his opinion, he would say this, that Exchequer control had become inefficient, anomalous, and unreal to a very great degree. Whether it should be, however, entirely abolished or modified was a question of great importance and delicacy, which he had not examined with that coolness and precision which would enable him to come to a positive conclusion upon it. His desire was that these separate duties should be maintained as at present, and with the fullest liberty on the part of Parliament to extend these duties by restoring the efficiency of the Exchequer control. It appeared to him that the practical differences between himself and those who had taken part in the debate were very small. He differed from his right hon. Friend (Sir Francis Baring) on one point, for he was fully convinced that the duties of Exchequer control were not duties sufficient in themselves to occupy the time of a public officer. It was, therefore, he thought, the duty of Parliament to remove the anomaly of what approached to be a sinecure. Nor would he admit the doctrine that had been urged of incompatibility of function in these two offices. He would repeat what he had before stated, that if there should be a desire on the part of the House to reserve its ultimate decision upon the union of these offices he had no objection. The only object he had was the practical one of laying the foundation of an improvement which would be permanently effected if Parliament should approve a reduction of useless and unnecessary offices. One suggestion would be met by altering the first two lines of the first clause, "on the occurrence of a vacancy in the said office," and substituting the words, "on the occurrence of the next vacancy in the office of Controller General." In the third clause the words "for the time being" might be struck out, and he would not object to the insertion of the words proposed by the noble Lord at the end of the clause. He could not agree to the omission of the second clause. The proper way would be to introduce some words making provision for the performance of all the duties that were now discharged, and he would not say more than that he did not think the performance of these duties required the maintenance of the Exchequer establishment as it now stood. The hon. Baronet (Sir George Bowyer) appeared to think that the tenure upon which the Chairman of the Board of Audit held his office — *quam diu se bene gesserit*—was a weaker tenure than that of the Controller General, who was only removable upon an address by both Houses of Parliament. Practically, there was a difference between the two, but the union of these two offices would be a reason for placing the tenure of both on the same footing, and the recommendation of the Select Committee that the Chairman of the Board of Audit should be considered to hold one of the first positions in the Civil Service was a reason for raising, not only his salary but his office, to the highest position of dignity and independence. The only subject he felt justified in pressing upon Parliament at the present time was the practical one of laying the foundation of an improvement which could be made permanent if Parliament should think fit—that, namely, of effecting one of the plainest duties of a person in his position—the relieving the public from the burden of an unnecessary expense. Some of the suggestions thrown out he should take into consideration. Though he could not say that the Bill would be productive of immediate economy, yet its tendency was towards economy. The notion that this Bill entailed an additional charge of £500 upon the public was entirely without foundation. He begged to disclaim any intention of questioning the motives of the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

INLAND REVENUE (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 207.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 6 *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Stamp Duties on Charter-parties reduced).

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he had some Amendments to propose in this clause, with a view to the convenience of persons who made use of charter-parties. There was a certain class of these documents which were sent from abroad as mere tenders signed by the party making the tender, and which became charter-parties when they were duly signed in this country. He wished in the case of these charter-parties to give a power, not generally conferred, of stamping the written document on the payment of only 6*d.* It would be better to negative the clause and bring up another.

Clause *struck out.*

Clauses 8 to 15 *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Receipts given for Sums deposited on Allotments of Shares, or for Calls on Scrip or Shares, not to be exempted from Stamp Duty).

MR. M'MAHON said, this clause made receipts given for sums deposited on allotments of shares liable to stamp duty. Was it not desirable that the letters of allotment themselves should also be subject to the duty?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the proposition of the hon. Gentleman was a new one, and might, perhaps, at some period be taken into consideration, but at present he felt precluded from requiring that letters of allotment should be subject to the duty.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 17 to 21 *agreed to.*

Clause 22 (Appeals against Adjudications on Stamp.—Duties in Scotch Cases to be heard in Scotland).

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, this clause directed that appeals against adjudications on stamp duties in Scotch cases should be determined by the Court of Exchequer in Scotland. He wished to know why appeals in Irish cases were not to be determined in Ireland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was under the impression that under the provisions of the Bill Irish cases would be determined in Ireland, but in the event of that not being the case, he would take care to introduce an Amendment to rectify the omission.

Clause *agreed to;* as were also Clauses 23 and 24.

Clause 25 (Amending the Law respecting Appeals under Excise Acts on Complaints before Commissioners and Justices).

SIR WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he wished to inquire to whom the appeal lay from the decisions of the Commissioners of the Inland Revenue and of the justices. He called attention to the large expenses attending appeals from the decisions of the magistrates in petty sessions on application for licences, and expressed some dissatisfaction at not having heard from the Chancellor of the Exchequer some intimation of the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill on the subject. Some drinking licences were granted as a matter of course by the Excise, while others were granted, or refused, by the magistrates; and the whole subject was in a most unsatisfactory state. He had hoped that the Chancellor would have introduced a clause which would have prevented the litigation and expenses likely to arise under this clause.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the appeal in the decisions referred to by the right hon. Baronet lay to the superior courts as in ordinary cases. The other remarks of the right hon. Baronet were rather wide of the objects of the clause, which related only to appeals with regard to decisions as to inland revenue questions. The question of licensing was a large, interesting, and difficult one. He hoped the Legislature would shortly approach its consideration, but he doubted whether the preparation of a measure to meet the difficulties was part of the proper duties of a Finance Minister.

SIR WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he thought that, as a large amount of revenue was raised under the licensing system, it was one that came within the functions of the Finance Committee.

On the Motion of The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, the following new clause was substituted for Clause 7:—

"In lieu of the stamp duty of 5*s.* now chargeable by law on any Charter-party, or any document chargeable with Stamp Duty as a Charter-party, there shall be charged and paid thereon the stamp duty of 6*d.*, and it shall not be lawful under any pretence whatever for the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to stamp, after the same shall have been signed, any Charter-party, or any such Document as aforesaid, which, after the expiration of one calendar month from the passing of this Act, shall be made on or by means of any printed form, or on a form which shall be partly printed; and if any person after the period aforesaid shall make or sign any Charter-party, or other such Document as aforesaid, which shall be printed or partly printed, and shall not be duly stamped for denoting the duty hereby charged thereon before the same shall be signed, he shall forfeit the sum of £50; Provided always that if any Charter-party or other such Document as aforesaid, which shall be wholly in writing shall be brought to be stamped within the respective times hereinafter mentioned, after the same shall bear date and shall have been first signed, the Commissioners shall stamp the same on the following terms—(that is to say) if within fourteen days, on payment of the Duty and 4*s.* 6*d.*, and if after that time and within one calendar month after such date and first signing, then on payment of the Duty and the sum of £10; but after the expiration of the last-mentioned period it shall not be lawful to stamp such Charter-party or other Document as aforesaid on any pretence whatever: provided always that if any Charter-party, whether printed or written, shall be first signed by any party thereto out of the United Kingdom, such Charter-party being unstamped, it shall be lawful for any party thereto within ten days after it shall have been received in this kingdom, and before the same shall have been signed by any person here, to affix thereto an adhesive stamp denoting the Duty chargeable thereon, and to cancel such stamp by writing across the same his name and the date when he shall so affix such stamp, and thereupon such Charter-party shall be deemed to be duly stamped."

Preamble.

Mr. AYRTON said, he wished to point out the growing necessity for a Bill to consolidate the whole of the laws relating to the Exchequer, in consequence of the yearly alterations in the Stamp Acts. Under present circumstances it was scarcely possible to find out the actual state of the law upon the subject without wading through innumerable clauses in various Acts; and, therefore, he trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take into consideration the propriety of introducing such a Bill on the assembling of the new Parliament. One of the anomalies requiring removal was this. A stamp duty of 30*s.* was required for a power of attorney to sign a document on which the stamp duty was 6*d.*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he felt the force of what had been said, and thought it would be very desirable that they should have a consolidation of the Stamp Acts.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he wished to direct the Chancellor of the Exchequer's attention to the fact that ships might be sold, assigned, or mortgaged without making any return to the revenue by means of stamps, and the law even provided an admirable and cheap machinery for doing so. It was for the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether the stamp duty, payable on the mortgage of land, should not be extended to the transfer of ships.

Mr. SCULLY said, he had to complain that in Ireland, in transactions with regard to land, persons had to pay double stamp duty as compared with the duty in England. In England they had to pay only a 10*s.* duty; in Ireland they had to pay an *ad valorem* duty besides. That double duty seriously interfered with the transfer of land in Ireland. It was a matter of great importance that the transfer of land in Ireland should not continue to be of the exhorbitant character it had been ever since the year 1858.

Mr. HADFIELD said, that with regard to settlements a gentleman had written to him stating that, in addition to the 5*s.* duty on every £100 *ad valorem*, he had also to pay £1 15*s.* for the deed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, if anybody wished to have the decision of the Commissioners with regard to the proper stamp to be put on the deed he could go to them, and if he was not satisfied with their decision he could go the Court of Exchequer.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, if his hon. Friends furnished him with the particulars of the several cases he would see what could be done.

Preamble *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next.

LAW OF EVIDENCE, &c., BILL—[Bill 20.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Parties to Action for Breach of Promise of Marriage to be admissible as Witnesses.)

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he would take that opportunity of making some general remarks upon the Bill, and would take a short retrospect of the law. During the many centuries in which justice had been administered in the Law Courts of this country, no one, up to a very recent period, could be a witness in any suit or proceeding in which he had the slightest pecuniary interest. At length, in 1828, Lord Brougham in his celebrated speech upon Law Reform called the attention of Parliament to this subject, and from that time until 1842, several successive efforts were made by Lord Brougham himself, by other members of the legal profession, and by Members of Parliament, to qualify and improve the law, but those efforts were made in vain. At length, in 1842, Lord Denman brought a Bill into the House of Lords, the object of which was to remove the disqualification of witnesses on the ground of interest. Lord Denman was opposed, he believed, by every

Judge upon the Bench and by almost every Minister of the Crown, especially those who had filled the office of Home Secretary, but his Bill was passed. For nine years after this the subject was agitated from time to time, and at length, in 1851, Lord Brougham brought into the House of Lords a Bill to make all parties to civil suits competent witnesses. Lord Brougham introduced that measure in a very memorable speech, which had the effect of doing away with the prejudices and objections of most of his hearers. He was, however, opposed by Lord Chancellor Truro, whose authority was the greater because he had been a leading advocate at the bar and had filled the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas; he was cautiously and timidly sanctioned rather than supported by Lord Campbell, but was earnestly sustained by another high authority, Lord Cranworth. The Bill, however, became law; and he believed that no change effected in our law procedure during the present century had been attended with more beneficial results. The Bar, the Bench, the Press, and the public were agreed as to this. But in that Act two exceptions of *quasi*-civil cases had been inserted, owing to the perseverance of those who had opposed the measure altogether. With the first of these exceptions—cases for breach of promise of marriage — Clause No. 1 of the present Bill was intended to deal. He did not deny that considerable objections might reasonably be made to the examination of the parties to this description of action; because loose conversations between two persons might be greatly exaggerated by one of them if a desire existed to establish a contract, and there was the danger of the sympathies of the jury being unduly exercised in favour of the lady. But it should always be remembered that the great object of all judicial proceedings was the discovery of the truth. He thought that the proviso of his hon. Friend the Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy), which would provide that there must be a promise in writing, would go far to remove the objections.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he was aware that in referring to those breach of promise cases he was touching on delicate ground; but he hoped he should avoid giving offence to any one in that House or in higher regions. He thought that the Legislature had shown its wisdom by making cases of breach of promise an exception to the general rule, for a person who was anxious for a good match would not stick at a trifle. If a man were with a woman without witnesses, what was he to do? Let the House imagine the case of a young man who was supposed to be a desirable catch, who had happened to meet a young woman of an imaginative or designing turn, and who had happened to be alone with her. After such an occurrence she might go into the witness-box and swear he had made a proposal of marriage to her which she had accepted. The defendant might go into the witness-box and say he had not; but if the woman was clever, designing, and, above all, good-looking, the great probability was that she would get the jury on her side, and the defendant would find considerable difficulty in extricating himself from the scrape. Cross-examination would not be very effective in such a case. He was afraid that the clause would lead to a good many marriages which would not be productive of domestic happiness. If the clause of the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) should be adopted, he thought it would nullify the clause altogether. To be consistent, his hon. and learned Friend should entirely do away with the law of evidence. He admitted that in civil cases the rules of evidence had been carried too far; but if he understood this Bill rightly, it was founded on the principle that every possible sort of evidence ought to be laid before a jury. Was his hon. and learned Friend prepared to go the length of admitting hearsay evidence? It was said that the parties who knew more about the matter than anybody else did ought to be heard. That might be true in some cases, but not in others; and in this particular instance the principle was, in his opinion, a dangerous one. It should be remembered that it was the interest of the parties concerned to deceive the Court. If the clause passed, at all events there should be a retrospective limitation; it ought not to apply to promises of marriage given before the passing of the Act, and then after the Act passed men would take care not to put themselves in a dangerous position, and would take care always to have a witness with them to state what really did happen. He objected to the clause and should certainly vote against it.

MR. ROEBUCK said, the arguments of his hon. and learned Friend against the clause were just those used against Lord Brougham's Bill, the merit of which, by the way, belonged not to Lord Brougham but to Jeremy Bentham. He could not agree with his hon. and learned Friend (Sir George Bowyer) that in a breach of promise case the man was as likely to be the injured party as the woman. It was much more probable that the man was the deceiver. He assured his hon. and learned Friend that he only spoke of women as he had done because he did not know enough of them. His hon. Friend feared that if women were allowed to tell their own story in the witness-box justice would be defeated, but could it be thought possible that if a woman swore, for instance, that his hon. and learned Friend had promised her marriage she would be believed? It was so unheard-of a proposition that it would be sure to be scouted. And why did his hon. and learned Friend think that he would be in a different position from any other defendant in such an action who would have the opportunity of being heard on his own behalf. With reference to the proposition which he understood was about to be made, that the contract should be in writing, it would be a substantial alteration of the existing law, and it was one to which he could not assent. It would, he believed, lead to great wrong and injury being done to women by deep designing men. Let them imagine a young, inexperienced, and pretty woman of eighteen, having listened to the honied words of such a person, addressing him in commercial language, and requesting that he should put his proposal to marry in writing, and duly sign it. If that proviso were adopted, the effect would be that there would be no such thing as a valid promise to marry.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he pitied the unfortunate man who ever defended an action for breach of promise when persons like his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Roebuck) were on the jury. He could not admit that men were always deceivers and women never; and certainly juries did not deal out anything like equal justice between them. The other day a lady brought an action against a gentleman who was lame and unable to take care of himself, and though her position would have been that of a nurse rather than of a wife, she recovered heavy damages for the loss of that position. In another case some years ago a lady with a large fortune made a solemn promise of marriage to a gentleman, and when he, being jilted, brought his action for the damage he had suffered by losing the material comforts he supposed he was going to obtain, he was dismissed with a farthing damages, amid shouts of contempt. Was this a reciprocal action; if so, was it treated fairly by juries? In the former case, the lady nurse received several thousand pounds; in the latter case the gentleman, after being kept several years waiting, was dismissed with a farthing damages, amidst the laughter of the people in court. Yielding in no respect to his hon. and learned Friend in devotion to those among the fair sex who did not bring actions for breach of promise, and having the greatest contempt for those who did, he would treat these promises in the way which promises of a much less serious character were treated under the Statute of Frauds. Because people were apt to construe that into a promise which was never meant to be one; the Statute of Frauds required that certain promises should be in writing; and if there was any one class of cases in which this precaution became necessary, it was in cases where marriage was in question, and promises were extorted, or imaginary promises were framed by mothers and sisters anxious for the match out of innocent conversations. Lord Brougham had himself made an exception, in allowing the action for breach of promise, the evidence of the parties, and it did not appear that Lord Brougham had changed his mind. No doubt, juries very much resembled in feeling his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Roebuck). When a young and pretty lady was set before them as having been deluded there was no holding them in. He remembered hearing an old member of the Northern Circuit, who had been a barrister in India, tell the story of a Circassian slave who had murdered the master of a harem there. He, as counsel, had to defend her. It was a bad case, but he said, "Put her in her best dress, the more transparent the better; set her opposite the jury, and I'll answer for the result." And the result was exactly what he predicted. She had stabbed the man, but the jury pardoned the crime for the sake of the interesting woman they saw before them. So in the case of an action for breach of promise. A young and interesting woman would get damages; but if a man was ever so young and interesting he got no damages, but had to pay heavy costs and get scouted besides. For his part, he thought this action might well be abolished, for he did not believe in the broken hearts of young ladies, who, directly they got a dowry in the shape of damages, got somebody else to console them. If, however, you must have the action, why not treat it as a serious matter? Why should not these promises be placed on the same footing as promises under the Statute of Frauds? In a class of cases with which magistrates at petty sessions were very familiar (bastardy), material corroborative evidence of the woman's statement was required, and the law was altered specially to require that, in consequence of the iniquities which had been perpetrated. The alteration which was proposed by this Bill was to create new evidence under circumstances which would make almost a new action, and if it were carried the class of cases to which he had referred would come into the courts as actions for breach of promise of marriage, instead of being as now settled before magistrates at petty sessions. He did not intend to oppose the clause; indeed, he should not vote upon it all, but he should move the addition of the following proviso:—

> "Provided always that no such action shall be hereafter brought unless the promise be in writing, signed by both the parties."

It was quite a mistake for the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Roebuck) to suppose that when a promise is made the young lady must sit down on the spot and write it out, and then call on the gentleman to sign it. This was not the case, nor was it the case under the Statute of Frauds. If the promise could be made out from any number of letters or other documents between the parties that was sufficient.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, that in the City of London the Statute of Frauds was practically a dead letter. A vast number of transactions took place without any writing at all, the security being merely the character of the parties.

Colonel SYKES said, he should support the clause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he agreed with the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) that this was a very exceptional kind of action. Why it happened he could not say; but his experience in courts of justice was that in actions for breaches of promise of marriage the women had it all their own way, and the men had no chance. The lady was well got up, placed in a conspicuous place, and the attention of the jury directed to her, and, of course, she was generally in tears. If she were placed in the witness box and cried under cross-examination, as they always did, it would be all over with the man. The jury, to show their chivalry, their admiration, for the fair sex, and their contempt for their own, would immediately return a verdict for her. If this amendment of the law were sanctioned, it would be found that a certain class of attorneys would come into Court with a crop of actions for breach of promise, which no single man could stand against except he had the advantage of the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Sir George Bowyer), and could protect himself by the vow of celibacy.

The CHAIRMAN put the Question, that the Proviso be added to the clause, and declared that "the Ayes have it."

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he saw no necessity for the words "signed by both parties." They might be omitted without any disadvantage. Love-letters which would be written evidence of a promise were not usually signed, or were signed generally with initials or with some fancy or assumed name.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he thought the purpose of the hon. and learned Member for Leominster (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) would be answered if it were provided that the promise should be "under the hands of the parties charged therewith."

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY assented.

Mr. HENLEY said, he understood that the Proviso had been agreed to.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, he rose to Order. He was against the Proviso, but he wished to see their proceedings carried on with order. He believed the Proviso had been declared to be carried.

The CHAIRMAN said, that was not so. The Proviso was not carried. He had put the Question, taken the Ayes and Noes, and had said in the usual manner, "I think the Ayes have it," when that expression of opinion was challenged by the hon. and learned Member for Suffolk (Sir FitzRoy Kelly).

Proviso, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. LONGFIELD said, he opposed the clause. He said he could conceive nothing more repugnant to the feelings than that any reckless individual should be allowed to call into the witness-box a woman, whom he had perhaps deceived, and subject her to examination and cross-examination as to the nature of her entire past life. The instincts of gentlemen revolted at this action being treated like an action on a bill of exchange or the sale of a bale of goods. He thought that the clause would have a detrimental effect, instead of being a protection to the sex, of which the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) was so chivalrous a champion, and for whom he had exhibited more feeling than he was ever known to display for any other portion of the human race.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 27; Noes 86: Majority 59.

Clause 2 (Parties to any suit instituted in consequence of Adultery may offer themselves as witnesses on their own behalf.)

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, that this was a most important clause. The object of it was not to compel parties in a suit for adultery to come forward and give evidence, but it gave the parties—the man or the woman—the option to come forward and deny the charge. In the Bill of 1851 this clause was not adopted. So great was the inconvenience felt in consequence of that omission that the learned Judge who presided over the Divorce Court had expressed his opinion that a clause like the present should be introduced into this Bill. When he introduced the Bill he took the liberty to read to the House a letter from that learned Judge to that effect. The clause in the Act of 1851, which disallowed parties in such suits to be called as witnesses, had given rise to some strange anomalies. In a suit for adultery neither party was competent as a witness, but if the suit was one instituted by the wife for cruelty and desertion, and if the husband should plead the adultery of the wife, then both parties were competent as witnesses either to prove or to disprove the adultery. Again, if the husband or wife instituted a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights, and if the wife should plead adultery, both parties were competent witnesses. The inconvenience was so great that an Act was introduced which provided that the wife or husband might be a witness in a case for cruelty or desertion, but not for adultery. When these three charges were combined, desertion, cruelty, and adultery, the Court and the jury, so far as regarded the evidence, were obliged to keep them distinct. It was a great injustice that a lady should be charged in court with the crime of adultery—that she should hear a friend, he might say a false friend, swearing to conversations which she was capable, perhaps, of directly contradicting or satisfactorily explaining—and that she should be unable to go into the witness-box to give her evidence. There might be cases of suspicion against a woman so strong as would satisfy a jury of her guilt, but she, who knew more than any other person in existence of all the surrounding circumstances which might tend to explain away what was suspicious, or qualify or give them a colour consistent with innocence, was excluded by our law from saying a word in her own defence. This question they knew had been much considered, not only by the learned Judge who presided over the Court of Divorce, but the most eminent members of the bar who practised in that court, and they all agreed in the policy and justice of the measure he now submitted to the Committee—a measure which he hoped would now meet the approval of Parliament. He moved in line 14, after "adultery" insert "in which any question of adultery shall arise."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that by this clause the hon. and learned Member proposed to give this power of offering evidence not in the ordinary way and subject to the ordinary rules of evidence. The hon. and learned Gentleman proposed to make husband and wife competent to appear as witnesses, but not compellable, so that he or she need not appear unless they saw fit. He (the Attorney General) looked with apprehension on the practical working of this; and if it were not for the high reputation of the learned Judge who recommended it, and a practical anomaly which existed in the present system, he should have great difficulty in making up his mind to agree to it. If, however, the law was to be altered, why should it be done in a manner wholly without precedent? Why should not the giving of this evidence be made compellable as well as optional? Such an exception to the general rule made the proposal condemn itself. If the reasons for the change were sound, why not go the whole length, and put evidence of this kind on the same footing as all other evidence? The argument which weighed most in favour of the change was that under the present law we had an anomalous and extraordinary state of things. If an action was brought, in which adultery was charged, neither party could be examined; but if the action was based, say upon cruelty, and in the proceedings a charge of adultery should arise by way of defence, both parties could be examined either voluntarily or compulsorily. If hon. Members could make up their minds to the enormous addition to the terrible scandals of these proceedings which would result from making husband and wife come into the box and give the past history of their whole lives from their own lips, the House would of course pass this clause; but if so, let them be consistent, and let not the examination or non-examination depend any longer upon the question whether the proceedings were commenced for adultery or for cruelty. This would only be adding to the existing anomaly, which it was the object of the clause to rectify. He should certainly vote against the clause if it were not altered so as to make such witnesses compellable as well as competent to give evidence.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he could not consent to make it compulsory upon husband or wife to give evidence as to their own adultery. The learned Judge of the Court also strongly objected to it. It was true that adultery was not an indictable offence, but it was a crime; and it was a well-known maxim of our law that no person, whether in criminal proceedings or in *quasi*-criminal proceedings, could be compelled to give evidence against himself. Under these circumstances he should take the sense of the Committee upon the clause as it stood; but he should propose a proviso, which would perhaps lessen the difficulties of the Attorney General. It was as follows:—

> "Provided always that no person though competent shall be compellable to be called as a witness on any issue which raises the question whether such person shall be guilty of adultery."

Mr. HUNT said, he rose to ask for an explanation. If a husband or wife presented himself or herself as a witness, were they to be subjected to cross-examination on points tending to criminate themselves?

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, that if they offered themselves as witnesses they would then open the door to cross-examination to any extent.

Mr. HUNT: Would they be compelled to answer questions to criminate themselves?

Sir FITZROY KELLY: Undoubtedly.

Mr. AYRTON said, he approved of the proviso, but could not support the clause. The hon. and learned Gentleman had better keep them separate, and then, if any clauses at all were left in the Bill when it came out of Committee, he would vote for it.

Mr. SELWYN moved the omission of the clause. He need add nothing to what the Attorney General had said as to its adding greatly to the enormous scandals which attached to these proceedings; and he could not be a consenting party to anything which would increase those evils. He admitted that great weight was due to the views of the learned Judge of the Divorce Court (Sir James Wilde); but in such a matter as this he felt bound, as a Member of Parliament, not to surrender his own judgment even to the opinion of one for whom he entertained so much respect.

Mr. MALINS said, that with respect to this being only a permissive clause its effect would be the same as if it were compellable. A person accused might or might not tender themselves to give evidence; but if they did not, what would be said by the learned counsel on the other side? Would not absence from the witness-box be held to be a direct admission of guilt? He had opposed the creation of this court from the first; and he deplored its existence now as one of the greatest public calamities of the country. He would consent to nothing which would increase and aggravate the evils arising from it, and he should, therefore, vote against the clause.

Mr. WALTER said, he felt some difficulty as a layman in offering an opinion on a subject of that kind; but he must take leave to say that he thought the arguments urged against the clause were by no means satisfactory. His hon. and learned Friends, the Attorney General and the Member for the University (Mr. Selwyn), had spoken in very strong terms—although in terms, no doubt, which were not stronger than were deserved—of the gross scandal to public morals to which divorce cases gave rise. But in a question of that nature what they had to look to was not whether more or less scandal or disgrace would be produced by the operation of that clause, but whether or not it would facilitate the ends of justice by eliciting the truth, and so tend to prevent innocent persons from suffering cruelty and wrong. These divorce cases were in themselves scandals, that was an evil inherent in their very nature, and it could not be helped. But if the effect of his hon. and learned Friend (Sir FitzRoy Kelly's) clause would be to assist in promoting the interests of justice, that, and that alone, would be his reason for supporting it.

Clause *negatived.*

SIR FITZROY KELLY said, that after the opinion just expressed by the Committee on the first and second clauses of the Bill he thought it would be an act of disrespect on his part towards the majority if he were to proceed any further with the measure.

House *resumed.*

[No Report.]

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT CONTINUANCE.—LEAVE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [12th June], "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue and amend 'The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856.'" — (*Sir Robert Peel.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. BLAKE said, that he must oppose this Bill as he had opposed the original Act when it was brought in. A Return for which he had moved some years ago showed that the counties and baronies in Ireland were proclaimed upon the most ridiculous and frivolous pretexts. Cork, for instance, was proclaimed, not because of any crime or outrage which had been committed, but on a charge of disaffection, in the year 1848. The fact that peace and tranquillity were observable throughout the county rendered the renewal of the Act perfectly unnecessary. When a barony in Ireland was proclaimed under the provisions of this Act no person was allowed to carry a gun without a licence, and it was an easy thing for any person to make a representation to the authorities that an outrage had been perpetrated, in order that a proclamation might be issued. The Chief Secretary must have seen that persecutions had taken place under the Act. In order to show the tyranny which had been practised under its provisions he might instance one or two cases which had occurred. In Tipperary a young lad possessed a toy dagger of the most harmless description, but his possession of this dangerous weapon having become known to the police they entered the house in which he lived and arrested him, and the boy was subsequently sentenced to a severe term of imprisonment. A short time since, in the same county, a man who had been to a fair and had become intoxicated was arrested. Four percussion caps were found in his pocket, and he was sentenced to a month's imprisonment with hard labour on the charge of being in possession of munitions of war—the lawyer by whom he was sentenced, and who acted in the absence of the barrister of the county, sapiently remarking that percussion caps were necessary for the use of fire-arms. In another case two boys taking part in the theatrical representation of *Douglas* were engaged in a mimic combat with old foils, when a sub-Inspector of police rushed upon the stage and took them into custody. The two lads were dragged through the streets and detained in prison during the night. No murder had taken place for a considerable time in the country, and it would be a graceful act on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw this Motion, and to leave the act to drop, at least for this year.

MR. SCULLY said, he had always opposed these Algerine Acts for Ireland. Such a thing would not be tolerated for one moment in England. The Bill was entitled, "An Act to continue and amend the Peace Preservation Act," a complete misnomer. He should like to know what amendments would be introduced by the Secretary for Ireland? Tipperary was always under the Peace Preservation Act. During the garrotting times in London he found it necessary to provide himself with a weapon, but when he went to Tipperary he was in danger of being arrested by an officious policeman for carrying weapons in a proclaimed district without having a licence, so he got a licence—a document printed in red ink—a sanguinary affair, giving him leave to carry one gun and two pistols. But this did not prevent bad characters having arms, and if a Member of Parliament passed through Tipperary with a fowling-piece and stopped at Goolds' Cross Station he would be liable to be arrested. Lord Lismore, the lord-lieutenant of the county, happened to send his gun by his servant to the gunsmith for repairs, and the policeman finding him with a gun in a proclaimed district — it was the town of Nenagh—brought him before the magistrates. And sometimes it was difficult to get a licence; the landlord of one of the police barracks, who was a tenant of his, applied to the resident magistrate for leave to carry arms, and he was refused on the ground that they were all thieves in that district. And in this Bill an arbitary power was given to the Lord Lieutenant to impose taxation in any district which was proclaimed a most objectionable thing.

MR. M'MAHON said, he hoped it was by accident that the Bill was not brought forward at an early hour, when English Members could see the nature of it. No such law as this was ever thought of for England or Scotland: and there was no pretence for it in Ireland where there had been no recent agrarium outrages. The Peace Preservation Act had been made a source of great oppression and injustice. He hoped the right hon. Baronet the Secretary for Ireland (Sir Robert Peel) would state to the House clearly the necessity which existed for the Bill, and what clauses he considered it imperative to pass.

MR. LANIGAN said, he must deny that Ireland was in a state to require the renewal of this Act. The gaols were almost empty. At the last assizes in the North Riding of Tipperary the grand jury disposed of the business in about an hour; and the judge who presided got rid of all the criminal cases in about six hours. He hoped the Bill would not be pressed.

MR. KER said, he objected to Bills of this nature, which were only intended to meet cases of disturbance and agrarian outrage.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that the charges delivered by the Judges during the last two or three years showed that there was no necessity for any such measure as this. Instances had occurred in almost every county in Ireland in which, without its being so intended, these Acts had operated oppressively, and he, therefore, trusted that, under existing circumstances, the right hon. Baronet would not think it necessary to press this Bill. The state of the county which he represented was conclusive against the necessity for such a measure, and the opinion of Irish Members was decidedly against it.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he was quite ready to admit that the state of the country was vastly improved from what it was in 1860. He believed that Tipperary was as peaceful and as quiet as the streets of London. Still there were certain districts which were considered dangerous and which had been proclaimed. In conjunction with the authorities at the Irish Office he had gone carefully through the proclaimed list, and with respect to certain districts of Armagh, to which the hon. Member for Wexford had referred, it was true they were proclaimed, but the proclamation had been withdrawn, and no part of Armagh was now proclaimed. The same might be said of the counties of Wicklow and Wexford. There was a proclamation in existence since 1861 for some part of the county Mayo, but he had consulted with the Irish authorities, and to-morrow he proposed to write to inform the Lord Lieutenant that there was no longer any necessity to continue the proclamation in that particular barony. But he appealed to the House to support him in giving power to the Government of exercising this power on occasions when it might be necessary. Certainly there were instances in which the Act had been carried out with great indiscretion, especially where some young men were interfered with who were acting the part of Norval. It was much to be regretted that there had been any interference on the part of the police, who had exceeded their duty and been severely rebuked. Stories were current which he did not believe, and alarm existed in the minds of some persons which he did not share, that there were some persons of the name of Fenians who were disaffected to the Government, and it was desirable that the Lord Lieutenant should have the power of exercising this power of proclamation when necessary. Parts of the counties of Antrim and Down were proclaimed in consequence of the disturbances at Belfast, and there the measure was not taken in order to insult the inhabitants, but as one necessary for the preservation of peace and tranquility. As soon as the state of things permitted it would be revoked. He trusted, therefore, the House would support the Government in this matter. The measure had been originally passed in 1847, and had been in force for nearly eighteen years. He should be the last man in the House to get up and support the measure if he thought it not necessary for Ireland. In this country it certainly was not necessary; but everybody must admit there was great difference in the circumstances of the two countries. This power had always been exercised in the most lenient manner. The Act would, if this renewal Bill were passed, continue for two years longer, and at the end of that time it would be competent for any hon. Members who might be then in Parliament to oppose or support the Government who might ask for its renewal. But meanwhile he thought it absolutely necessary to place this power in the hands of the Government, and he hoped the House would assent to the Motion.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he trusted that English and Scotch Members would give the Bill some further consideration. The Chief Secretary for Ireland admitted that the Bill was of an exceptional character. No substantial reason had been given for its introduction, and he was quite certain that it would not be tolerated for England. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that the state of Ireland afforded no justification for the passing of such a penal measure. Some gentleman connected with the North of Ireland asked for the Bill, because Ireland was filled with peace and contentment, and the right hon. Gentleman asked for it because Ireland had vastly improved, and was free from outrages. Tipperary was as peaceful as London, and there was no necessity for such exceptional legislation. The right hon. Gentleman said that he did not believe in the existence of the Fenians, and therefore this Bill must be passed. Surely the House would not support this reasoning. He blushed with shame when he saw Volunteers parading through London while they were not permitted in Ireland. If there were any reason for this Bill, he (Mr. Maguire) would readily agree to it; but in truth there was none. The Government had not pursued a generous policy towards Ireland; and he thought that it was time that they did so. England would not bear one-tenth of such severity as the Bill proposed to inflict upon Ireland which was now in a state of permanent tranquility. The wisest policy Government could adopt would be to trust the people rather than to exhibit this continual distrust of them. He was aware it would be absurd as well as factious to fight the Bill through its various stages, but it was the duty of Members who opposed it to take one division in order to show their feeling upon the subject.

MR. TORRENS said, he thought that Government would be very unwise if they did not press this measure.

MR. ESMONDE said, that his experience was, that in places which were proclaimed the Government did not carry out the law, and he instanced Belfast, where, notwithstanding the locality being proclaimed, there were a great number of arms, as was proved by the firing which took place during the recent disturbance. He should vote for the Bill in the hope that the Government would enforce it where necessary.

COLONEL DUNNE said, he would vote for the Bill if it were necessary, but the fact was crime in Ireland had decreased. He thought that at all events the Government should give them some distinct assurance that there was a necessity for the Bill before the House was asked to agree to it. He should like to know what local authorities the right hon. Baronet had consulted before he framed the measure, for he (Colonel Dunne) had never heard of the magistrates being consulted upon the matter, and if it were the police only who had given their opinion he must say that he should distrust them. Mere stories about Fenians should not form the ground of penal legislation. Nor did disapproval of the acts of the Government form disloyalty.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, what he had stated was that he did not believe in the disaffection of the Fenians, of which they had heard so much; neither did he believe that the loyalty of the people of Ireland would allow of an insurrection being attempted either by that or any other body of men.

LORD JOHN BROWNE said he trusted that in the course of a few years this Bill might be altogether done away with, but thought it would be premature to permit it to drop at present. When all disturbances in Ireland ceased the Bill would fall to the ground of itself. Of his personal knowledge he could state that the local magistrates had been consulted in reference to this Bill.

MR. HENLEY said, he regretted that the right hon. Baronet had not given some stronger reasons for the continuance of this anomalous law. He (Mr. Henley) had always been very much averse to the continuance of such legislation, especially in face of the fact that there was a decrease of crime in Ireland in proportion to the population. The right hon. Baronet seemed to think no more of the continuance of this legislation than of blowing his nose. He (Mr. Henley), however, thought that they ought to know the precise grounds upon which it was proposed, and why the Government thought that the common law of the land was not sufficient to keep the peace in Ireland. This seemed at first sight a very innocent Bill, but to repeat an expression which had been used, there was a great deal of white brandy in it. He was most anxious to see the same laws in England and in Ireland, and he repeated that before they proposed such an exceptional law as this they should have a statement of strong grounds for it.

MR. ROEBUCK said, he wished to refer to a very peculiar circumstance connected with this Bill—namely, that during the last Administration of the late Sir Robert Peel this Bill had been introduced and rejected by a large majority, and Sir Robert Peel was turned out. Now that the state of Ireland had greatly improved the Bill had been again introduced. It did not come with a very good grace from the party who had before resisted it.

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 135; Noes 43: Majority 92.

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ROBERT PEEL, Sir GEORGE GREY, and Mr. LUKE WHITE.

ROMAN CATHOLIC OATH BILL.

[BILL 86.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. MONSELL, in moving the third reading of this Bill, said, at that late hour of the night he was compelled to ask the kind indulgence of the House whilst he made some brief observations in reply to the objections raised against the present measure. With regard to the objection so generally made that this Bill ought not to have been brought in by a private Member, he begged hon. Gentlemen to recollect that this Bill was not one to impose any new oath or burden, but it was one simply to repeal certain clauses in the existing oath taken by Roman Catholic Members. He hoped if the measure should be successful that it would lead to the adoption of one uniform oath for all. Such a Bill, he would admit, ought to be brought in by the Government; but it was perfectly fair that those who complained of certain clauses of an oath which they had taken should make their complaint to the House, and, if it were well founded, that their grievance should be redressed. But the real point to which he wished to draw attention was the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) in his opposition to the measure: because if this Bill should fail in arriving at that stage when it would become law, such failure would be owing to that right hon. Gentleman alone. It was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire who had rallied his party to endeavour to mutilate the Bill in its progress through Committee. If, then, the existing oath be preserved it would be owing to the right hon. Gentleman alone. Now, upon what grounds did the right hon. Gentleman oppose the measure? Why, the right hon. Gentleman said that the oath was of no use at all—that the Protestant feeling was so strong in the country. ["Order, order!"] He (Mr. Monsell) believed that he was perfectly in order in alluding to the statements made upon this question by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire. ["Order!"] He (Mr. Monsell) asserted that he was in order. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Protestant institutions of the country were so strong that the oath was of no use at all—that it was a mere sentimental grievance on the part of the Roman Catholic Members, and that it was better for them to allow the oath to remain as it was. Well, he (Mr. Monsell) wished to ask whether it could be a sentimental feeling on his own part when he declared that he felt deeply the grievance of being obliged to take that oath. He believed, from Arundel Castle down to the humblest habitation in which lived a Roman Catholic town councillor, that oath was looked upon as a grievance and an insult by him who was compelled to take it. The right hon. and learned Gentlemen the Members for the University of Dublin and Belfast (Mr. Whiteside and Sir Hugh Cairns) said the oath was perfectly clear and simple, but Lord Althorp, Lord Campbell, and Sir Robert Peel entirely differed from them. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Belfast quoted Mr. Sergeant Shee's statement with regard to the meaning of this oath, and said that he entirely agreed with it. Now, the fact in connection with that statement was, that immediately after he had made it—which he did in a note attached to a pamphlet pnblishing his speech—Mr. Napier, the then Solicitor General for Ireland, stated in that House that by the course he had taken he (Mr. Sergeant Shee) had broken the oath. Mr. Napier, therefore, charged Mr. Sergeant Shee on that occasion with perjury. Was not an oath, therefore, that could be interpreted one way by one gentleman and another way by another, ambiguous and a grievance to every honourable man who was called upon to take it? It had been said in the course of the debate that the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) was not obliged to take it, but he (Mr. Monsell) was. The other day, in looking over some petitions, he found that an admirable one had been presented to the House by the Commissioners of Supply of Aberdeen in favour of this Bill. Immediately following it was one from the congregation of Baptists, against the Lahore bishopric, signed by 2,000 persons, in which they said they were opposed on principle to any Church established by law, as being unjust and detrimental to the best interests of the nation. They (the Baptists) were not required to take this oath, but they required those who had no such feelings with regard to the Established Church to do so. Was that, he asked, just? Now, with regard to the constitutional part of the question, the late Sir Robert Peel did not impose it as a check on the legislative action of Roman Catholic Members. Was it, therefore, constitutional, or was there any other instance in which such a restriction was imposed? The object of tests was to exclude persons holding opinions considered objectionable. In 1675 an attempt was made to limit the legislative action of Members of Parliament, and a Bill passed the House of Lords, after seventeen days' discussion, which contained an oath which required Members to swear that they would not in any way alter the constitution of Church and State, but it was thrown out in the House of Commons. The Parliament of Scotland in 1681 passed a similar Bill, which the Earl of Argyle refused to take without giving an explanation of his meaning of that oath, and he was tried for high treason, and although he escaped at the time, was afterwards executed for that crime. That he believed was the only instance where a Member of Parliament had been interfered with in his legislative action, and it became the occasion of a foul and abominable crime. Under these circumstances, he did not think that he was asking anything unreasonable when he asked the House to abolish the present form of oath, and he contended the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire, who was the most powerful opponent of the Bill, had not adduced any reason why the oath should be retained. It would be much better for them to have confidence in each other, and act together in union. He thanked the House for the support they had given to the measure in that House, and he expressed a hope that it would meet with the same success in the other House of Parliament. The institutions of the country would in no degree suffer by such an act of generosity. It would confirm and strengthen them in the affections of the people, more than all the oaths the ingenuity of man could frame.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time." —(*Mr. Monsell.*)

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that hon. Gentlemen opposite invariably represented the oath as a case of grievance, and complained that its words were vague, obscure, and ambiguous. But the words were identical with those which were sent by the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops to the Government of Sir Robert Peel, and they were drawn up by those ecclesiastics in order to induce the Government and Parliament to consent to the passing of the Emancipation Bill. The instructions given to those who drew up the Emancipation Act were to throw aside everything that was offensive, and to frame such an oath as the whole body of Roman Catholics could take. In 1821, when Mr. Plunket endeavoured to frame an oath for all Members he failed, because the Vicar-General of the Midland District told him that he had misunderstood the principles of his (the Roman Catholic) Church. Accordingly, in 1829, an oath was framed which was voluntarily taken and welcomed with acclamation by Roman Catholics, and was now, after they had obtained by it all they required, discovered to be a grievance.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he did not ask the House to reconsider their decision; but he wished to remind them that this oath formed only one part of the protection to Protestantism which, as was stated by the right hon. Gentleman who last spoke, was stipulated for and agreed upon when the concession to the Roman Catholics was made in 1829. Another portion was that certain institutions of the Romish Church, the order of Jesuits, should not be allowed in this country without registration; but, from returns which he held in his hand, it appeared that the latter stipulation had been altogether disregarded. The Government did not enforce the law, and there were now no less than seventy of these institutions in the country, illegal because unregistered. He thought that the Government ought to be called on to enforce the clauses of the Act of 1829 which contained what were regarded as protections to the Protestant Church.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) asked a pertinent question of Members on the Opposition side of the House—namely, why did they not insist on the Nonconformists taking an oath similar to that demanded by the existing law of Roman Catholic Members of that

House. If the right hon. Gentleman had read the pastoral issued only that morning by Dr. Manning he must have perceived that the question which had arisen between the great body of Protestants in this country and the Roman Catholic priesthood, was not a question which could arise with regard to the Nonconformists. The Nonconformists had no foreign connection. The Nonconformists of the advanced school objected to all established churches; they did not seek establishment for their various religious opinions in the ordinary sense of that term. But it was obvious that the highest authorities of the Roman Catholic priesthood contemplated the re-establishment of the Roman Church in this country as a rival establishment competing with and endeavouring to supplant the Church of England; and therefore it was only right that the House should require a declaration from Roman Catholic Members that, in seeking to establish the Church of Rome, they would not dis-establish the Church of England. He agreed with the right hon. Member for Limerick, though for a different reason than the one given by him (Mr. Monsell), that the grounds stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) for opposing the Roman Catholic Oath Bill were totally insufficient. The discussions in that House for years had shown that there were many grounds for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic oath, which were not adverted to by the right hon. Member for Bucks. In 1854, in 1857, and in 1858 the House deliberately rejected Bills similar to that now before the House. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Monsell) no doubt rejoiced at the great progress which had been made towards the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in this country; but he asked the right hon. Member whether, in the circumstances of the day, or in the documents recently issued by the Papacy to the authorities of the Roman Church, there was anything to show that the maintenance of the terms of the oath was less desirable now than formerly? It appeared to him (Mr. Newdegate) that there were reasons why the Roman Catholic laity would act wisely if they were to support the continuance of the oath, having before their eyes the examples of France and Italy. Only that day he had read in the *Dublin Review* an article on the recent encyclical letter of the Pope. The writer advocated the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope by force, justified the coercion of those who dissented from Rome, justified the intolerance which characterized the laws of Spain; and all he wrote in conclusion, by way of excuse, was that, under existing circumstances, it would be unsafe to attempt such coercion in this country. Under these circumstances he thought the right hon. Gentleman could not be surprised that a large minority of that House adhered to the course which had been theretofore the course of the majority—a course, which had been enforced by the majority even when the measure contemplated other objects as well as those of the present Bill, and was proposed by the Government. He trusted that he might thereafter meet with the indulgence of the House in the performance of that which he believed to be his duty, inspired by no spirit of intolerance, but acting, as he believed, in the interests, not only of the Protestant, but of the Roman Catholic Members of the House.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

RECORD OF TITLES (IRELAND) BILL.

[BILL 151.]—(*Lords*)—COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 62 (Record to be managed by certain Officers of the Court).

MR. SCULLY said, he wished that the fees in Ireland should not exceed those in England, and he begged to propose an Amendment to that effect.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he thought the Amendment was unnecessary.

Clause *agreed to.*

MR. WHITESIDE moved the following clause:—

> "That any person who has obtained from the Commissioners for the sale of Incumbered Estates in Ireland or from the Landed Estates Court a conveyance or declaration of title, or who shall hereafter obtain the same, may apply, every five years, by summary petition, supported by such evidence as the Court shall require, to be declared the owner, with registry of indefeasible title as originally granted by the Court; and upon the declaration of the Court, granted and registered or recorded as may be required by law, the person named therein shall be deemed owner as declared to all intents and purposes; such declaration shall not be chargeable with the percentage duty provided by the Act."

He said the clause would be very beneficial to landed proprietors in Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must decline to accept the clause.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he regretted the determination of the Attorney General; but he had the satisfaction of having done his duty in proposing the clause.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 217.]

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE.

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Motion of Lord CLARENCE PAGET,

1. *Resolved,* That the Expenditure incurred for certain Navy Services in the year ended the 31st day of March 1864, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £494,360 2*s.* 4*d.*; and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Navy Services, and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year, has amounted to the sum of £298,009 3*s.* 8*d.*

2. *Resolved,* That the said Expenditure for Navy Services unprovided for as aforesaid, amounting to £298,009 3*s.* 8*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other votes for Navy Services, amounting to £494,360 2*s.* 4*d.*

3. *Resolved,* That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

On Motion of The Marquess of HARTINGTON,

4. *Resolved,* That the Expenditure incurred for certain Army Services in the year ended the 31st day of March 1864, has fallen short of the sums appropriated to those Services by the sum of £789,378 12*s.* 9*d.*, and that the Expenditure which has been incurred for certain other Army Services, and not provided for in the sums appropriated to those Services for the same year, has amounted to the sum of £210,381 11*s.* 10*d.*

5. *Resolved,* That the said Expenditure for Army Services unprovided for, as aforesaid, amounting to £210,381 11*s.* 10*d.*, has been temporarily defrayed, under the authority of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of the Surpluses which have arisen, as aforesaid, upon other votes for Army Services, amounting to £789,378 12*s.* 9*d.*

6. *Resolved,* That the application of so much of the said Surpluses be sanctioned.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

THEATRES, &c. BILL—[BILL 64.]

SECOND READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [13th June] read.

MR. LOCKE said, he would name Monday for the resumption of the debate.

VISCOUNT GALWAY said, he would appeal to the hon. Member to withdraw the measure. He had made his speech, and he ought to be satisfied, and not give Members the trouble of coming down to the House to oppose it, because he had no earthly chance of carrying it this Session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be further adjourned till Monday next."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, June 16, 1865.

MINUTES.] — *Sat First in Parliament* — The Lord Ashburton, after the Death of his Brother.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Admiralty Acts Repeal * (165); Admiralty Powers &c. * (166); Dockyard Ports Regulation * (167); Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * (168); Navy and Marines (Wills) * (169); Roman Catholic Oath * (170).

Select Committee—On Mortgage Debentures, Earl Belmore, Earl Grey, and Lord Redesdale *added.*

Report—Locomotives on Roads * (164).

Committee—Union Chargeability (122); Dockyard Extensions * (143); Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment * (117); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) (Provisional Order Confirmation) (No. 2) * (147).

Report — Dockyard Extensions * (143); Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment * (117); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) (Provisional Order Confirmation) (No. 2) * (147).

Third Reading — Dogs Regulation (Ireland)* (129); Militia Ballots Suspension *; Militia Pay *, and *passed.*

EXHIBITION OF MINIATURES AT KENSINGTON—QUESTION.

EARL STANHOPE said, he wished to call the attention of the noble Earl the Lord President to the general complaint of the exorbitancy of the sum of 5*s.* each fixed for the price of the catalogues provided for visitors to this exhibition. He thought the sum of 5*s.* was unnecessarily high, or at all events that another edition might be provided at the cost of 2*s.* 6*d.* each. He was sure that his noble Friend, whose liberal feelings in these matters were well known, would be ready to adopt any step tending to increase the popularity of this exhibition, and he thought that if the price of the catalogues were reduced a much larger number of persons would be induced to visit the exhibition.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he would be extremely glad to see this exhibition rendered as popular as possible, but he felt bound to say that it had been found necessary to fix the price of the catalogue at 5*s.* in order to insure, as far as possible, the defrayal of the expenses, and to prevent having recourse to other sources to meet the necessary charges.

THE SLAVE TRADE PAPERS.

QUESTION.

Lord BROUGHAM said, he regretted the absence of his noble Friend (Earl Russell), as he wished to urge strongly upon him the early production of the slave trade papers. These only came down to December, 1864, while much of importance had occurred since this period. The slave trade of Cuba had increased in the most frightful manner, notwithstanding the repeated promises and contracts of Spain. Her conduct, indeed, was detestable and disgraceful. She had concluded a treaty with us many years ago for its abolition on receiving a large sum as compensation for any possible loss she might sustain. He could not say that treaty remained unexecuted, for she had received the money, but not performed her obligations. Instead of making a law (as she had promised) making slave trade piracy (which she could not do regularly without the general concurrence of nations), she had made flimsy proclamations and mock laws, while the infernal traffic went on increasing. The difficulties lay both in Cuba and at Madrid. In Cuba Earl Russell declared in a despatch last year that all ranks, from the highest, without any exception, were in a state of demoralization and corruption as regards slavery and the traffic; and at Madrid, when a noble had fallen into distress he was sent out as governor to Cuba to restore his fortunes; and some had actually made £100,000 or £150,000 in a year from the bribes of the slave traders. One was a great exception, General Dulce, who honestly and strongly enforced the law against the abominable traffic. He had not been supported at Madrid, however, and a person bearing, he grieved to say, the honoured name of Arguelles, had grossly libelled him because he would not overlook his slave trade dealings. This man had been tried and disgraced, and sentenced for his misconduct, but the sentence was not executed upon him. The conduct of Spain was disgraceful, and he conceived that the true remedy to enforce her performance of the treaty was to impose a heavy duty on slave-grown produce. His illustrious Friend, that great warrior and statesman, the Duke of Wellington, the saviour of Spain, had plainly expressed that opinion, and Lords Denman and Ashburton had held the same opinions. We repeatedly protested against the conduct of Spain, and our repeated protests were treated as so much empty wind. But if we were in earnest and chose to make Spain perform her contract, and abolish the infernal traffic, we had the means in our own hands both of compelling the mother country and the colony, by imposing a duty on Cuba slave-grown produce, which would at once abolish her slave trade.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he could not, off hand, give his noble and learned Friend the information he required with respect to the papers; but he would make inquiry on the subject.

CHURCH SERVICES AT ST. ALBAN'S—CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—LAW OF EVIDENCE.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH rose

"To bring before the House the Information promised in Debate to The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London on Friday the 12th of May respecting Infractions of the authorized Worship of the Church of England, which were particularly mentioned as having been practised in the Church of St. Alban, Holborn, as well as in other Churches; and also the solemn Oath alleged to have been taken by the Rev. J. Going, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Lorrimer Square, and his Curates, in a Pastoral Address issued by him respecting Confession, and called the Seal of Confession."

The noble Marquess proceeded to say that it was argued in some quarters that the Protestant religion was so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people of this country that it was impossible to weaken it. He agreed that the Protestant religion was deeply rooted in the hearts of the English people; but, at the same time, he thought there was the utmost danger in those objectionable practices. When this matter was noticed in their Lordships' House on a former occasion the Bishop of London stated that the infractions complained of were not sustained by such evidence as he could act upon; but, on this occasion, he was prepared to state in the hearing of the right rev. Prelate facts which there was evidence to prove. He had the evidence of some eight or nine respectable witnesses who were present at scenes which their Lordships would have some difficulty in believing could have been enacted in Protestant churches. He himself had attended the church of St. Matthias, at Stoke Newington, on Whit Sunday, and on his return home he made a note of what he had seen and heard there. The church was furnished in a very unusual manner. The part of the Morning Service which he was enabled to hear and the Psalms were intoned very unintelligibly to the Gregorian music. After the Morning Service there was a long pause, during which the bell tolled. A youth came forward with a lighted taper, made a low bow at one extremity of the table, and lit a candle, and then ceremoniously went round to the other end of the table, made an obeisance, and lit the other candle. The table appeared to be covered with a crimson embroidered table-cloth, upon which stood a large black cross on a black ground, and several vases of flowers were on the table. The two clergymen who read the Lessons and the Morning Prayers had a red strap over their shoulders, with, apparently, a brass cross at the end. The two clergymen and a younger one and the choristers, who were very numerous, had now assembled at one side of the chancel, apparently for the purpose of making a procession down the centre of the church, which they proceeded to do, singing a hymn. In the centre of the procession was a man carrying a large brass cross elevated. The three clergymen had crimson-coloured garments, reaching very low down on their persons, ornamented with gold or gilt lace. This procession differed in nothing that he could perceive from the ceremonial processions usually met with in the streets of Roman Catholic towns on the exhibition of the Host. The three principal performers now separated from the rest and went towards the communion table, and there remained with their backs to the congregation, until a youth brought forward a plated or tin pot, from which he threw clouds of incense. The principal then turned round and pulled up some part of the machine, thereby obscuring the whole chancel from view by the clouds of smoke that arose from it; then, turning round to the table, he incensed every part of it, and everything upon it, as well as the book in the hands of the other individual, who read the Gospel after it had been incensed. They then went on intoning the Ten Commandments: and it was only by hearing occasionally a word in the responses that he knew what part of the service was being performed. During the whole of this time the little boy kept swinging about the incense-pot interminably. At the end of this, one of the clerical performers, having put off his red costume, went into the pulpit with the white surplice on, having the red strap over it. A part of his doctrine was that the red costume which his company wore represented the tongues of fire that appeared upon the Apostles, red being, according to him, the colour of fire; but, in his humble opinion, the vestment in question better accorded with the scarlet drapery of the woman in the Book of Revelations. Another eye-witness had given him the following statement of the same service:—

> "Prayers were intoned, and so imperfectly pronounced, as to make it impossible to know whether the language used was English or Latin. Morning Prayers being ended, the church bell rang for about a quarter of an hour, the three priests and the choristers went away. Presently a youth appeared with a long lighted taper. He was dressed in a white gown tied in at the waist. He lit the two candles on the communion table, going well round the corners of the table to perform this ceremony. On the table was a tall cross and several vases of flowers, the church also was ornamented with wreaths, bouquets, and hoops of the everlasting yellow flower. One of the priests entered bearing a plate covered with a crimson cloth on his head and put it upon the table. The bell ceased ringing, and a hymn was sung. At its commencement there issued forth from the vestry door a procession, the chorister boys, two and two, some one bearing a very tall brass cross raised on high, and lastly the three priests, who were dressed in crimson, braided with gold. The procession moved slowly and with practised steps down the middle of the church, and back again up the chancel, where each chorister took his place, the three priests walked towards the communion table, and stood there with their backs to the assembled people. Two boys stood within the rails, one with the incense holder, which

> he heaved to and fro. The principal priest then turned round, took the incense, caused it to emit volumes of smoke, and, turning towards the table, he threw the incense smoke about in every direction. One of the priests then read the Epistle; after which another priest, taking an illuminated book off a desk, or stand, on the table, gave out the Gospel, then, turning towards the principal priest, he held the book wide open, while clouds of incense arose over it. After intoning and chanting (unintelligibly) the Communion Service, one of the priests went off, and, divesting himself of the outer crimson overall, ascended the pulpit and preached a sermon, telling us that those red dresses symbolized the tongues of fire that fell upon the Apostles, the colour of fire being red."

The church bell rung for a quarter of an hour, and the three priests, with a number of choristers, proceeded to the communion table. One of the priests entered with a cloth, which he placed upon the table, and then the three priests, with some of the choristers, proceeded to the vestry, whence they returned dressed in crimson robes blazing with gold. Incense was profusely cast about, and, after some further ceremonies, one of the priests divested himself of his robe and entered the pulpit to preach the sermon. He had many communications upon the subject, but most of the writers, while they expressed their willingness to come forward if a properly constituted court for dealing with such matters should be formed, said they did not desire their names to be made public at present. He had also to refer to another church—St. Mary's—in the same parish of Stoke Newington. He had been informed by a respectable gentleman resident in that parish, and who had been for some time churchwarden, that being apprehensive that the rector was about to introduce a number of novelties into the service he appealed to him to abstain from doing so. A large sum of money being then necessary for the repairs of the church, the gentleman, upon the faith of the rector's promise that no innovations should be introduced, assisted in collecting the amount required. Immediately the money was raised, however, the rector changed his mind, and introduced the modern system. He believed that the right rev. Prelate had tried to bring about a better state of things, and had offered to arbitrate. An attempt was made to ascertain the feelings of the parishioners, and it appeared that the singing party numbered 800, while the reading party were 4,000. The noble Marquess then read an account of his visit to the Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, where similar ceremonies took place, and before commencing the sermon the priest made the Popish sign of the Cross on his forehead. The noble Marquess also read a description of the services at St. Alban's, Holborn, and Christ Church, Clapham, which were marked by the same characteristics, floral decorations, banners, frequent genuflections, and the like. The noble Marquess then proceeded to say that there were one or two other matters to which he desired to call the attention of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London). As his Lordship was pleased to say that if any Tractarian Prayer Book were used in the churches—which his Lordship very much doubted—proceedings against the offending clergymen should be at once taken, he wished to call his attention to the book he held in his hand, which had been in use in St. Alban's Church, Holborn, where the book itself was purchased. The right rev. Prelate stated that a complaint had been formerly made, which, when investigated, proved to have reference only to the use of an ancient hymn which had been also used by the Church of Rome. But this book contained not only hymns, but prayers and litanies not found in the Book of Common prayer—hymns and prayers in several instances containing doctrines wholly at variance with those of the Church of England, and which were specially protested against by that Church. There could be little doubt that a very large proportion of the hymnals now in use in many of the churches of the country, including *Hymns, Ancient and Modern*, which he understood had a circulation of a million copies, and were said to be in use in several cathedrals and a large number of parish churches, contained doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church insiduously introduced into them—a circumstance which it was the duty of the Prelates to deal with at once. There were many errors of the Roman Catholic Church introduced into this book, while Roman missals, breviaries, and other works of devotion among Roman Catholics had been placed under contribution to supply poisonous food for the people's souls. It did not require much theological learning to see that Mariolatry, the Invocation of Saints and Angels, Transubstantiation, the Real Presence, and Prayers for the Dead, had all a place in this book. The organs of the Tractarian party mentioned the churches where these services were used; and as the matter seemed to call for investigation he should present the papers to the Lord Bishop of London. The question was one which concerned millions of members of the Established Church, as well as all those who sympathized with her Protestant Articles and Formularies, and any attention given to the subject would not be misspent.

He had now to call attention to a statement he made on a former occasion relative to the public letter addressed to the parishioners of St. Paul's, Lorrimore-Square, Walworth, by the Rev. J. Going, incumbent, and his curates, the Rev. F. W. Helder and the Rev. W. G. Abbott, in which, after urging the parishioners to come to them for the purposes of confession, they say, "Remember that your clergy are bound by a most solemn oath never to betray your confidence." The right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) very properly denied that he ever administered such an oath, and also declared that the administration of such an oath would be a misdemeanor; but the question remained why such a document should be put into circulation, containing inducements to criminals to take clergymen into their confidence on the allegation that they had taken a solemn oath—clearly an illegal one—not to betray the confidence thus reposed in them? There were guilds, confraternities, and sisterhoods in which, he understood, that vows of questionable legality were taken. Mr. Lyne, who called himself "Father Ignatius," for instance, in a report of a lecture delivered by him at Manchester, and revised by himself, said—

> "We have established a branch of our Third Order in Newcastle and its members are sworn to bring about a daily celebration of the Eucharist in the town, if possible."

As a practical commentary on this system of administering and taking illegal oaths, they had read of the excommunication fulminated by Brother Ignatius against two members of his "Third Order," residing in Bristol, who, in that document, were charged with the crime of perjury—of having broken some oath of obedience to himself, and they had been in consequence cursed with the utmost possible vehemence by this mountebank. And now he would ask the right rev. Bench what they intended to do? It was at one time his intention to use his privilege as a Peer and represent these matters in an audience to Her Majesty; but he had rejected this course on reflecting that, in taking that step, he should be bound to use the privilege by craving leave to go into the Royal presence through the medium of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whom it had been his painful duty to unmask in reference to the case of the unfortunate Mary Ryan. He felt bound to notice the illegal conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department in refusing, on the most flimsy pretexts, to prosecute those who must be regarded by every reasonable man as having infringed the law. When he found that he must proceed through the agency of Sir George Grey, he was reminded of the exclamation of Cromwell, "The Lord deliver me from Sir Harry Vane!" and he exclaimed, "The Lord deliver me from Sir George Grey!" He would ask, whether it was the intention of the right rev. Bench to leave matters in their present condition, or whether it was proposed by them or by the Government to legislate upon this subject with a view to putting an end to these constantly recurring scandals. He could only hope that the appeal which he had made to the Members of the right rev. Bench would not have been made in vain.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, he had to express his thanks to the noble Marques for bringing these facts under the attention of their Lordships. The matter was, of course, a very serious one; and he believed he was giving expression to the sentiments of his right rev. Brethren when he said that they regarded it in a very serious light. But he feared the facts brought forward by the noble Marquess were so intimately connected with fresh legislation, that it was doubtful whether he had touched upon any real remedy. In more than one instance he (the Bishop of London) had had occasion to consult the highest legal authorities upon the course to be pursued in these cases, and his conviction was that the impediments which at present existed rendered action in these matters extremely difficult. One great difficulty was the existence of a rubric which provided that the ornaments of the Church and its ministers shall be retained, and be in use as they were in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. That rubric was, he hoped, capable of such an interpretation as he himself put upon it; but it was clear that its existence introduced great uncertainty into the law. He was perfectly ready for his own part, and he believed he might express a similar readiness on the part of his right rev. Brethren, to promise his support to any well-considered measure introducing an alteration which would tend to remove this difficulty. A point, too, in which the law required alteration, and an alteration which he should also be prepared to support, was another rubric which provided that where doubt was entertained upon any subject of this kind reference should be made to the bishop of the diocese, and in case of his decision not being deemed satisfactory to the archbishop of the province, whose decision was to be final. At first sight this remedy appeared to be an extremely easy one; but in many cases in which he had endeavoured to apply this mode of settling the matter, he had been met with an objection which he believed to be insuperable. The rubric said, "If they have any doubt" but in these cases the clergyman invariably said that he entertained no doubt at all upon the subject, and therefore declined all reference to himself, the archbishop, or any one else. All that they could say, therefore, was that the law was in a very unsatisfactory state. It was said that these evils could not be put down until a new court was established to deal with them, but it was an alteration in the law, and not a new Court that was required. While deeply deploring such follies as those to which the noble Marquess had referred, he felt convinced that he should have the sympathy of his right rev. Brethren when he regretted, as on a former occasion, the difficulties which obstructed them in attempting to deal with these matters. Bishops were invested in ecclesiastical matters with a twofold authority. The first was the authority their advice always carried with it, and to which he was glad to say by far the majority of the clergy, not only in his own diocese but throughout the kingdom, were always ready to accommodate themselves; but in case any persons were not willing to listen to the first kind of authority, the bishops could only fall back upon their legal authority, which was of course circumscribed by the written law, the uncertain nature of which rendered it difficult for the bishop to do more than protest against these evils, and use his personal influence to procure their abatement. There were, however, two other parties who might do much to discourage these things, the patrons and the parishioners. A good deal of power was lodged in the hands of the patrons. If they appointed improper persons they had themselves to thank. And the parishioners also could use much lawful and proper influence in the election of churchwardens, for in their choice of persons to fill this office they had once every year an opportunity afforded them of expressing the view in which they regarded these matters, and, if they thought fit, of assisting to put an end to them. In the churches to which the noble Marquess had alluded what had taken place might be supposed to be the will of the parishioners, as expressed by the election of the churchwardens. He trusted that in the district churches—for it was principally in those churches that these matters were complained of—the parishioners would bear in mind the solemn duty which devolved upon them in their choice of their churchwardens. Of course, the noble Marquess would not expect him to enter into all the subjects to which he had alluded, and especially he could not in that place say much as to revelations or concessions made by individuals to clergymen in whom they confided. The particular instance to which the noble Marquess had referred appeared to show nothing more than that the clergyman referred to was accustomed to listen to such matters as his parishioners chose to divulge to him. If the noble Marquess would refer to his (the Bishop of London's) primary charge he would find the subject to which he alluded treated at very considerable length. He believed also that the sentiments of others of his right rev. Brethren had been as publicly expressed on the same subject. He might without offence allude to his Grace the Archbishop of this Province, who in another diocese, now a long time ago, had occasion to inquire into a complaint relative to the practice of confessing to clergymen, and all that took place at that time at Leeds had been published, the sentiments of his most rev. Brother being as clearly expressed as his own sentiments in the charge to which he had alluded. It would be the greatest mistake to suppose that the bishops were not quite aware of the very great evils which the noble Marquess had pointed out, and he should be most anxious in any way that he could by the use of his legitimate influence to dissuade the clergy from the practices complained of. But he was bound in justice also to say that one distressing part of the case was this—that many of those who were making themselves conspicuous in this way were men of very deep piety, and were sacrificing their health to their most self-denying efforts in the poorest parts of his diocese.

Lord EBURY said, he desired to make a few observations on the subject which had been brought forward by the noble Marquess, to whom in the outset he must offer his best thanks for the courage and perseverance he had displayed. He said courage, because whoever ventured to do what the noble Marquess had done was certain to be severely criticized and pointed at as an intolerant bigot. It could not, however, be any longer denied that the great increase in those practices to which the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Westmeath) referred was causing a deep feeling of disquietude among the Protestant portion of our fellow-countrymen, and that the public discussion of the subject could no longer be adjourned—with all his heart he wished it could—no matter could possibly be less inviting. It was apt unduly to excite the minds of men, and in treating of it, however much a man might desire, it was very difficult to avoid giving offence. What was it that they complained of? They saw a Church, whose confessors and martyrs suffered and bled to establish it in the utmost purity of doctrine and simplicity of ritual, gradually approaching in its doctrine and ritual to the Church of Rome. They had transubstantiation, in all but the name; auricular confession, penance, priestly absolution, prayers for the dead, ornamental vestments, emblematic banners, and processions, crucifixes, incense, candles lighted in broad daylight, with an exaggerated amount of music in the service. They were told, indeed, that these things were contrary to law, and that the law was sufficient to repress them; but the obvious rejoinder to this kind of reply was, that the law was the same as it had been for the last twenty-five years; and that so far from these practices having been put an end to, they had during that time gone on steadily increasing. The right rev. Prelate had himself acknowledged that the law was powerless. Scarcely a week passed without hearing of something new in these matters. The Bishop of Exeter—no mean judge in these matters—had recently refused to consecrate a church in Torquay because of its Romish ornamentation and the manifest tendency of the practices of the clergy of the church to lead men over to Rome. Only a fortnight ago the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby), in presenting a petition, told them that the church of a very populous parish—St. Martin's, in Liverpool—had a very small congregation because of the eccentricities practised by its incumbent. What those practises were they were informed by another noble Earl later in the debate—the use of incense and auricular confession. The right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) told them that the right rev. Bench would not shrink from the prosecution of such cases; but he added that the law was not clear, that it was difficult to obtain information, and that he did not move unless he was sure the law was on his side. In truth, from some reason or other, the law was of but little use in stemming the evil. The case was put by one of the newspapers known for its High Church leanings (*The Morning Post*) with so much truth and fairness that he could not help quoting two sentences from it—

> "There can be no doubt that the use of incense in Divine service, the interpolation of unauthorized prayers, and certain processions are wholly without excuse; they are additions to the prescribed ritual, and are a moral, though perhaps not a technical, violation of the Act of Uniformity and the oath of canonical obedience. The difficulty is, how to bring the case of delinquency home to any offending clergyman. People often feel scandalized who shrink from being mixed up with a prosecution."

The evil, therefore, went on unchecked, until the Protestant world were startled by some such scandal as that of Mr. Wagner and Miss Constance Kent, which revealed to them how their Church was being undermined and destroyed. He might, perhaps, be asked, if things were in such a state, what was the remedy he had to propose? He confessed that in a House where Her Majesty's Government was so largely and ably represented, and where almost the entire Bench of Bishops had seats, it was hardly fair to put upon a private Member the responsibility of finding a remedy for the dilemma in which the Church now found herself. However, in this instance he stood perfectly clear. Five years ago he made a Motion urging their Lordships to address Her Majesty for a Royal Commission to revise the rubrics, formularies, and canons of the Church; and upon that occasion he met with an opposition so overwhelming as almost to cast an air of ridicule upon his Motion, and he was compelled to allow it to be negatived without a division. The canons, rubrics, and formularies of the Church remained unrevised; in many respects absurd, obsolete, and contradictory regulations perplexed the administration of the law, and he appealed to the right rev. Bench to confirm what he was about to say—that the language of some of the rubrics and occasional services went far to palliate, if they did not absolutely justify, some of those practices which were so bitterly complained of. But he addressed himself to those distinguished persons who occupied the right rev. Bench, and he ventured to suggest to them one means of combating this evil, which would not need the putting the law into operation, or the expenditure of a single shilling. Partly from their high offices, partly from their own characters, partly from the patronage which they had at their command, they had, or they might have, a paramount influence in their respective dioceses. Now, if they would cause it to be understood that they entirely set their faces against these practices and those who dabbled in them—if they would check them wherever they saw them springing up, and make it unmistakable that they gave neither support nor countenance to them—though it might not put an end to them altogether, it would, at all events, go far towards it; and it would tend very much to restore confidence to the public. But could they say with truth that such had been the conduct of the right rev. Bench? Let their Lordships look at the recent charges. Did they see any attempt made to grapple with that evil? Why, they had been startled by one of the latest of those charges, which seemed to point to the desirableness of making advances to the Church of Rome. These expressions had since been explained; but he must say, considering the circumstances in which the Church now found itself, a more dangerous utterance could hardly be imagined; and he was afraid, therefore, that they must say that while, generally speaking, the Bench was indifferent, there were some right rev. Prelates who gave a tacit, and some an open, countenance to many of the practices—thus bringing the Church into troubles and dangers, both religious and political, of which it was impossible to foresee the issue. That subject was very far from being exhausted, but it was not his intention to trouble their Lordships further than with a few words upon one point—he meant the exaggerated amount of music in the services inflicted by relentless clergymen upon reluctant congregations in rural districts and parish churches. The choral service was undoubtedly legal in cathedrals; it was doubtful whether it was so in ordinary parish churches and chapels. Many people were very fond of it, and it was a great pity that any one should be deprived of what he liked. Unfortunately, however, it was found that it was almost invariably the thin end of the wedge—the premonitory symptom of the coming of those objectionable Romish practices of which it was complained; and he protested as strongly as he could against the youth of this country being educated in a school which had a tendency towards that Church, of the members of which he desired to speak with perfect respect, but against which our own Church was intended to be a standing protest. The right rev. Prelate had told them that many of the persons who introduced these practices were very pious and self-denying men. He believed it, and he respected them for it; but he asked whether Roman Catholic priests did not display equal self-denial, and whether they did not refuse to marry in order that they might devote their lives to the relief of suffering and distress? Therefore, that argument was entirely beside the question. The right rev. Prelate had also spoken of the power of the churchwardens; but the churchwardens had in many instances done their best without being able to get rid of the evil. The public were, then, in this matter in an evil case. They saw how little the law had done for them, and his noble Friend the noble Earl below him (Earl Granville) had informed them the other night that while he was by no means prepared to deny, and was certainly prepared to regret, the existence of those things which the noble Marquess opposite had set forth, yet that the Government had no remedy to propose. Well he knew, and had always been forward to admit, that these things could not be remedied all at once, in a moment; but he earnestly trusted that their Lordships did not intend to sit with folded hands, rejecting all proposals for a remedy, until this matter became the property of a popular agitation, and passed out of the domain of calm and deliberate settlement.

LORD HOUGHTON said, he could by no means agree with the noble Lord who had just sat down as to the desirability of discussing—

LORD REDESDALE rose to order. They were carrying on a discussion without there being any Question regularly before the House.

LORD HOUGHTON said, he hoped he would be permitted at least to make one remark, and that was that he sincerely trusted the Members of the right rev. Bench would not allow themselves to be induced, in consequence of the speech of the noble Lord below him, to adopt any tyrannical action towards any portion of the Church. It was much to be regretted that the noble Lord had come forward in that House to speak in harsh terms of highly honourable and pious men, whose lives were devoted to the cause of charity and benevolence, simply because they differed from him in certain of their religious opinions. ["Question!"]

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, who was also met with cries of "Question," said, he had intended to offer a few observations on the subject brought forward by the noble Marquess; but he could assure their Lordships that, however strong might be his own feelings on the subject which had just been brought under their notice, yet if the continuance of the discussion was at all irregular he would not then say a single word upon it.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH wished to say only a few words in reply; but there being a general cry of "Order" the noble Marquess sat down.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

STANDING ORDER NO. 25. NEW STANDING ORDERS.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND *moved*—that the Resolutions of the 10th of March 1857, regulating the Mode of taking Divisions, be now vacated: The same was *agreed to.*

Then it was *moved* to *resolve,*

"That when, on the Question being put, a Division is called for, the Lord on the Woolsack or in the Chair shall order Strangers to withdraw, and thereupon the House and the Side Lobbies shall be cleared of Strangers, but not the Galleries and the Space within the Rails of the Throne, unless the House shall so order:

"That as soon as the Order has been given for Strangers to withdraw, the Clerk at the Table shall turn a Two Minute Sand Glass, to be kept on the Table for that Purpose; and the Doors shall be locked after the Lapse of Two Minutes, as indicated by the Sand Glass, and the Lord on the Woolsack or in the Chair shall then again put the Question:

"That the Contents shall go forth through the Door on the Right Side of the House near the Throne which leads to the Right Lobby, and shall proceed through the Right Lobby and re-enter the House through the Door on the Right of the Bar; and the Not-Contents shall go forth through the Door on the Left of the Bar which leads to the Left Lobby, and shall proceed through the Left Lobby and re-enter the House through the Door on the Left Side of the House near the Throne:

"That any Lord may, on the ground of Infirmity, by Permission of the House, have the privilege of being told in his Seat; and that the Votes of such Lords and of the Lord on the Woolsack or in the Chair be taken first:

"That Two or more Tellers be appointed for each Division without respect to their Degree; and that Two Clerks be in attendance at each Division to take down or mark the Names of the Contents and Not-Contents respectively; and that such Clerks be stationed in the respective Lobbies as near as conveniently may be to the Doors through which the Contents and Not-Contents re-enter the House:

"That if any Lord shall have by Mistake gone out with the Contents or Not-Contents (as the Case may be), having intended to vote on the other Side, he shall wait until the other Lords in the same Lobby shall have passed out, and on presenting himself to the Tellers desire that he may not be counted by them, he having entered that Lobby by mistake; and the Tellers shall thereupon come with such Lord to the Table and inform the House of the Circumstance, and shall ask the said Lord whether he was in the House when the Question was put, and if he shall reply in the Affirmative, whether he desires to vote Content or Not-Content on such Question, and the Vote of the said Lord as then declared by him shall be taken by the Tellers in the House, and recorded by them accordingly:

"That when Proxies shall be called, the Names of the Lords Content and Not-Content who vote by Proxy shall be respectively taken down and marked by the Clerks at the Table:

"That the Tellers shall count the Votes, and announce the Numbers to the Lord on the Woolsack or in the Chair; and the Doors shall remain locked until the Numbers are declared:

"That Lists of the Lords present and voting shall be framed, in which the Names shall be inserted in Alphabetical Order, and similar Lists of the Lords who have voted by Proxy; and such Lists shall be appended to the Minutes of the Day:

"That in such Lists the Names of the Lords shall be inserted according to the Titles by which they sit in Parliament; but in Cases in which any have higher or more ancient Titles or Dignities the higher or more ancient Title or Dignity shall be added in brackets:

"That each Division, and the Number and Names of the Lords voting thereon, be also inserted in the Journals, the Names of the Lords being placed in the Order in which they stand in the Roll, the Proxies being recorded in a separate List:

The same was *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the said Resolutions be declared Standing Orders, and that they be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders of this House.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FISHERIES' COMMISSIONERS.—QUESTION.

The Marquess of **CLANRICARDE** asked Her Majesty's Ministers, Whether the Chairman of the Fisheries Commission, appointed under the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 114, is a Clerk of the House of Commons? And, Whether Her Majesty's Ministers will consent to the Appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the Working and the Results of the abovementioned Act? The Act which was now before the other House for amending the Salmon Fisheries' Act, professed to follow the Act which had worked so well in Ireland. Now, the English Bill provided a form of appeal which was quite different from that provided by the Irish Act; and, in fact, it appeared to be drawn up without the slightest consultation between the parties. The Act was so badly drawn that when it expired, as it must do at the end of next Session, every owner with a good title, whose weir had been pulled down, might set it up again, and the trial would begin again. This, however, was not a matter of right or title, it was a matter of practice and procedure, and he hoped the Government would consider the case with a view to appply a remedy.

Earl **GRANVILLE** said, that in answer to the first Question of the noble Marquess he had to state that Mr. Eden was a clerk of the House of Commons, and was appointed clerk to the Committee appointed to inquire into the fishery laws; and the Chairman of the Committee, who previously had not known Mr. Eden, recommended him to the Government as the fittest person to preside over the Commission. It was a temporary appointment, which could not endure for more than two or three years, and Sir Denis Le Marchant had consented to allow Mr. Eden's name to remain upon the list of clerks of the House of Commons, he receiving no pay, and it being understood that he was not to re-enter upon those duties unless there should be a vacancy. With respect to the capabilities of Mr. Eden, from the information he had received from the Irish Office and from the Home Office, it was their opinion that a fitter person could not have been appointed than this gentleman; and a high legal authority who had been consulted, in consequence of a difference which arose between Mr. Eden and one of the legal members of the Commission, was surprised at the just and admirable manner in which he had decided most difficult and intricate cases. With regard to the manner in which the Commissioners had discharged their duty, he might mention that there were only forty-four appeals from their decisions out of an innumerable list of cases determined; that fourteen of these were heard; that only one was decided against the Commissioners, and then only upon a technical point, and that the other thirteen were given entirely in their favour. A very large number of the other appeals were withdrawn in consequence of some of these decisions; and, as far as he could ascertain, the administration of the law by the Commissioners was irreproachable. The Commission would expire in another year, and he was sure their Lordships would agree that it would not be desirable to appoint a Committee to conduct an inquiry which would involve legal points, or matters in course of being determined by the Commissioners. The noble Marquess had asked whether the Government would consent to a Committee of Inqniry, but the noble Marquess had given reasons why such consent should not be given. As to legal difficulties which had arisen, it could not be expected that their Lordships would interfere with matters that were before the legal tribunals. He was informed that there had been forty-four appeals, of which fourteen had been decided, one only against the Commissioners, and that upon a technical point.

The Earl of **DONOUGHMORE** said, that there were several vague charges against the Commissioners, but in spite of the assertions of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Clanricarde), and of certain violent articles which had been published, he thought that their Lordships would be of opinion that these gentlemen had performed their duty. He (the Earl of Donoughmore) was much interested in one river, and could say that the public feeling in that part of the country was strongly in favour of the Commissioners. Certain persons had taken possession of public rights of considerable value, and under the Act of 1863 they had been compelled by the Commissioners to give them up; these persons were, no doubt, much dissatisfied at being obliged to surrender up what they had, in fact, got by usurping the public rights. The fact, however, was, that the Act, and the way in which it had been carried out, had conferred an inestimable benefit upon Ireland, and had furnished employment for a great many fishermen who had been previously starving.

UNION CHARGEABILITY BILL.

(No. 122.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee read.

Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill.—(*The Lord President.*)

THE MARQUESS OF BATH observed, that in the face of the division which took place on a previous evening, and of the statement that the introduction of any Amendments made in the Bill would be a virtual rejection of the measure, he felt that it would be useless for him to move any Amendment in Committee. He wished, however, to offer a few observations to their Lordships upon the matter. As to the argument that the labouring classes suffered under the present law and would be much benefited by the proposed changes, he would say a few words. The Bill contemplated two distinct objects—the modification of the law of settlement and the extension of the area of rating. The alteration in the law of settlement proposed was an extension of irremovability to cases of residence for one instead of for three years, the period at present required. The law of settlement, or rather the removals consequent upon it, were a great hardship upon the poor, and for his part he should be glad to have seen the Bill go a great deal farther in reference to this part of the subject. There was no argument for the change proposed which did not apply equally to the total abolition of the law of settlement, and his objection to this part of the Bill was that while the measure was an improvement upon the present law, it was a measure which, so far from aiding, would only tend to retard the progress of legislation towards the total abolition of the law of settlement. After this Bill the hardship of removals would remain, although the number of them might be diminished. Let them look who were the parties interested in the maintenance of the law of settlement. The abolition of the law would throw a considerable charge upon the town parishes; and, therefore, it was that Parliament had made a compromise with the town parishes by saying, "We burden you with a modification of the law of settlement, but we relieve you by throwing the country parishes into the area of your rating." The representatives of towns had great power in the House of Commons, and his own impression was that this measure would very much impede instead of promoting legislation for the total abolition of the law of settlement. Now, as to the advantage to the labourer. It was said that the present limited area of rating was an encouragement to landlords to demolish cottages, or, at all events, not to build them. There was nothing to support the truth of this statement except the statistics of Mr. Simon and the statement of Dr. Hunter; but he contended that the statements made did not support the conclusions to which he had referred. He denied, however, that any demolition of houses had been going on of late years, although houses might, of course, have been demolished in exceptional cases for the purposes of property. The Returns which had been made in the case of the parishes in which this demolition was alleged to have occurred showed that out of 821 parishes selected as exemplifying this demolition nothing of the kind could, between 1851 and 1861, be shown in 290 instances. From 1841 to 1861 the number of houses in 419 of those parishes had either increased or remained stationary, and on going back another ten years the total number of houses in the 821 parishes exhibited a decided increase. The obstacle to the increase of houses was, however, due not to the action of the Poor Law, but to the expenditure which was necessary for their erection. The cost of a cottage might be put down at £125, though he himself had always found them to exceed that sum, and the value of the land upon which it was erected at £25. Now, in the agricultural districts of England, no higher rent could be demanded than 1*s.* 6*d.* a week, or £3 18*s.* a year—about half the ordinary interest on the outlay, and making no allowance for what would have to be expended in repairs and other matters. Cottage building, therefore, did not, and could not pay, and as long as this was the case no alteration in the Poor Law would lead to an increase of cottage building. Now, what would be the effect of the measure upon the labouring classes? He maintained that the land did not naturally find employment for the people for more than eight or nine months in the year, and that during the remaining months the labourer was employed by the farmer comparatively at a loss, though that loss was not so great as it would be if the man were thrown upon the rates. The weak, the old, the infirm, for whom labour was found by the farmers now, would be forced, if this Bill were passed, into the union workhouse. Farmers could not pay the rates twice over. They could not pay for the unnecessary labour as well as the rates in the towns. A great deal was said of this being a landowner's question. As far as he could gather he did not believe the landowners generally would be injured by the Bill. In his own case he would be a large gainer. The landowners would suffer only in special cases—in the thinly-inhabited rich grazing counties. He did not think farmers generally would suffer. It was the people that would suffer; and he did not see what could be done to help them, unless they made some large change in the law regarding the administration of relief to the poor in the rural districts, in whose behalf alone he had taken the liberty of addressing these observations to their Lordships.

Lord KINGSDOWN said, he could not permit this Bill to go into Committee without shortly expressing the grounds of the objections he entertained to it. He objected to it both on the ground of justice and policy. It was fraught with injustice in this respect—that it threw upon one class the burdens which at present properly belonged to, and by law was imposed on, another. He objected to it on the ground of policy, because it sapped the very foundation of that principle to which he believed they were indebted for the admirable effects of the new Poor Law—namely, the vigilant superintendence of parochial relief by the guardians of each parish. Unions had been formed almost universally on this principle—there was a country town with probably a large population; that was made the centre of the Union, and the agricultural villages around were added to it. He might mention the parish of Sittingbourne, with which he was himself connected. In addition to the ordinary population of the town, there was a numerous body of labourers who were engaged in extensive brickfields in the neighbourhood. A vast number of cottages were run up, over which that population was distributed. These men earned extremely high wages during the summer months—perhaps 30*s.* a week; but in the winter their work was stopped and they were thrown on the parish. By this Bill they proposed to make the agricultural parishes, which had no connection with the town, and derived no benefit from the population, contribute to the rates by which that population was to be maintained. Besides, a tradesman was not rated for his capital, stock in trade, or profits; but landowners or landholders were called on to pay on their stock-in-trade, capital, and farm stock—rated to the full extent. Not only did they pay for the maintenance of a population to which really they ought not to contribute, but in a greatly increased ratio—more than they ought to be charged. Could anything be more unjust than this? The injustice of the Bill was perfectly monstrous. What reason had been assigned for this alteration of the law? The reason assigned for it had entirely failed. The demand for labour was great. Instead of cottages being pulled down, cottages were rising on all sides, partly because farmers required them and partly because landowners wished to see their labourers properly housed on their estates. The reform which had been effected in the administration of the Poor Law was greatly due to the fact that the Guardians from the different parishes who made a point of attending, and who had an interest in seeing that none but proper objects received relief, had performed their duty with the greatest fidelity. At present it was the interest, as well as the duty, of the landlords of each parish to take care of their labourers, and prevent them from being thrown on the rates; but the case would be altered by the operation of that measure, and its effect would be to charge those parishes which did their duty in that respect with burdens caused by the neglect or misconduct of other parishes. Some years ago the population of a parish in Kent being very redundant, a large sum was raised in it to aid the unemployed in emigrating, and by that means its surplus population was reduced. But by this Bill that parish would have thrown upon it the charge of maintaining a town population with which it had no connection, and also the poor belonging to parishes which had incurred no such expense for emigration. He could not but think the measure was most objectionable both on grounds of justice and of policy. With respect to any Amendments which might be introduced into it in their Lordships' House, he was not in the least apprehensive that, if they were carried, there would be any difficulty raised on that account by the House of Commons on the ground of privilege. He could not suppose that the other House would strain the doctrine of its privilege in respect to matters of revenue to an extent to which common sense showed that it could not reasonably be carried; but if that course should be taken the result would be that they would gain a respite from this measure for another year.

LORD LYVEDEN said, he could not think it desirable that that Bill should be postponed for another year. The question with which it dealt had been constantly inquired into for the last thirty years, the arguments on both sides were thoroughly exhausted, and he could see no possible advantage in any further delay. The object of the Bill was to bring about a change, which all authorities had held would be most beneficial to the labourer—namely, to give him a wider range and a freer scope for making the most of his industry. The opinion of the noble and learned Lord who had just spoken was no doubt deserving of respect; but it was directly at variance with all the Reports of Commissioners and Committees, and with the views of all who had devoted the closest attention to this subject for many years past. Sir James Graham — no mean authority—said the parochial system favoured the idle and profligate, and discouraged the industrious, skilful, and well-conducted labourer — it protected the former class from competition, and placed fetters upon the latter. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Bath) seemed to doubt whether the feeble and the aged poor would be cared for in their own parishes under the proposed system as much as was the case at present; but, in the Docking district, where union chargeability had been voluntarily adopted, no such result as the noble Marquess apprehended had been produced. It had been objected to this Bill that it did not go far enough; and he quite agreed in that opinion. If the Government remained in office they must look forward to an alteration of the law of settlement which, in the last century, Adam Smith deemed to be the greatest infringement of personal liberty, expressing at the same time his wonder that the people of this country had not revolted against it long ago. Of all evils inflicted on the pauper that of removal was the severest; and if by this Bill they unfettered labour, he hoped they would soon have another measure abolishing the principle of settlement throughout the whole kingdom. They had obtained freedom of trade, and he thought now they should obtain freedom of labour. He did not think it advisable that the adoption of the Bill should be delayed any longer, and, indeed, he believed that the sense of the country could more faithfully be taken upon it in the last Session of the expiring Parliament than in the first Session of its successor.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND, in supporting the Bill, said, he had been a Member of the Committee of the House of Commons which had sat so long to consider this subject, and which was composed of men perfectly conversant with the question, and who were almost unanimously of opinion that in time a union settlement, or even a measure of a more extensive character, would have to be adopted. The general tendency of recent legislation had been to reduce the period of residence in a parish necessary to create a settlement, and he could see no reason, after that period had been reduced from five to three years, why it should not be still further reduced to one year. The time had come when this advance should be made, and although he foresaw that great benefits would result from this measure, he believed that the evils which some noble Lords seemed to apprehend would not be realized. In reference to some observations which had been made during the discussion, he might say that although the poor might be well treated under the present system in certain parishes, they were not taken proper care of in other parishes. He could not regard this question as one between the towns and the country as it was one involving the general welfare of the poor throughout the kingdom. There had, no doubt, been great complaints of close parishes, and that cottages had been taken down to get rid of the poor; but his own conviction was that in the present day there was no new foundation for such charges. The condition of the poor had much improved during the last few years, owing to the increased demand for labour and to the large additional amount of cottage accommodation afforded them all over the country, new cottages having been built, some through self-interest and some through philanthropy. There was a great change in the condition of the labourer compared with the times in which the new poor law was passed; and there was now a great demand for labour everywhere, which made it desirable that the labourer should be enabled to carry his labour to the best market. He did not think there was any serious intention on the part of their Lordships of opposing the Bill, to which he gave his hearty support.

LORD DENMAN said, he had presented two Petitions from Boards of Guardians—one for and the other against this Bill, but had been reported to have presented two Petitions in favour of the Bill. The Guardians of the Bakewell Union, knowing that he wished it to be referred to a Select Committee, yet intrusted him with their Petition at rather a small meeting, and the majority of the Guardians had wished to convene a meeting afterwards to oppose the Bill; but, seeing the great majority in their Lordships' House for the second reading, had abandoned their intention. He feared, with the Guardians of the Belper Union, that decayed towns would be supported by the agricultural districts, and that the Bill went too fast towards a general rating, as no preparation had been made for equalizing the rate.

Motion *agreed to*; House in Committee accordingly; Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 171.)

COURTS OF JUSTICE CONCENTRATION (SITE) BILL—(No. 141.)

COMMONS AMENDMENT CONSIDERED.

Commons Amendment to Lords Amendment *considered.*

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that on the third reading of this Bill, his noble Friend (Lord Redesdale) moved an Amendment, which their Lordships passed, to the effect that no steps should be taken to secure property, and that no contract should be entered into for the erection of the proposed Palace of Justice, until the plans and estimates had been submitted to and sanctioned by Parliament. The Commons had consented to an alteration in the provisions of the Bill in that respect so far as that proceeding should be stayed until a certificate had been received by the Treasury signed by all the Commissioners, which he thought would meet the views of the noble Lord on their Lordships' Amendment. He moved, therefore, that the Commons' Amendment be agree to.

LORD REDESDALE said, that what the Commons had consented to was a complete admission that the matter required serious investigation, and he had full confidence that the Commission would do its duty in that respect. He had had since the Bill was before their Lordships some communication with the Incorporated Law Society, and he was sorry to find, from their views on the subject, that the country would probably be subjected to a very much larger expense than the sum which had been named, if it were desired to have anything which would be worthy of the name of "a Palace of Justice." They told him that the estimates were made for the plainest possible building, that it would be impossible to take the suitors' money for ornament, and that if the country wanted that sort of thing the money for it must be sought elsewhere; and that, as to the approaches, they had nothing to do with them, as the Metropolitan Board of Works would see to them. He (Lord Redesdale) was convinced that the estimates were insufficient, and he thought it right that the public should know what it had to expect. There was, however, one thing to be said—a good Baker Street elevation would be quite sufficient for Bell Yard and Carey Street; and as to the Strand, the best thing to do there would be to erect a row of shops, and put the building behind it in order to secure somewhat more quietude for the business of the Courts.

LORD DENMAN was very sorry that the diffidence of the noble Baron, prevented his retaining his Amendment, for a more extravagant, speculative, and absurd plan had never been heard of; and as for its architectual pretentions, it was impossible to make it anything better than a bad imitation of the Four Courts at Dublin. The Bill was chiefly intended to enable barristers to hold briefs in all the courts at once, and in Westminster the present buildings, with a few additions, were good enough, if short causes only were tried in term, and long causes after term. He (Lord Denman) had for eighteen years attended in the courts, and had done his best for the welfare of suitors, solicitors, and all engaged in the administration of justice, and had been badly paid for it, but he staked his reputation on the fact that these courts were unnecessary. The approach to the Carey Street site would be wretched for those who wished *differtum transire forum populumq*, whilst the withdrawing the sittings from Guildhall would be most inconvenient to suitors, to jurors, to witnesses, and would prevent merchants from easily sending for documents to their counting houses, and from being permitted to receive and answer any important note as to business in the jury box, which was often done by the permission of the Judge. He wished their Lordships would at once reject these Bills, and then New Boswell Court could be occupied, and lodgers return to those houses which were now deserted. He regretted being opposed to both sides of the House, and giving offence by his opinion on this subject, but he was sure their Lordships would one day regret having ever authorized the dust of demolition, and if these were the last words he had to speak he should utter them in deprecation of this Bill.

Motion *agreed to.*

COURTS OF JUSTICE BUILDING BILL. (NO. 23.)

COMMONS REASONS CONSIDERED.

Commons Reasons for disagreeing to Lords Amendment *considered.*

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, their Lordships had struck out the 27th clause of this Bill, and the Commons had re-inserted it, as the effect of striking it out was the taking of £200,000 from the Government without any return for it. The noble and learned Lord moved that their Lordships do not insist upon their Amendment.

On Question, whether to insist? *Resolved* in the *Negative;* and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

House adjourned at Nine o'clock,
till Monday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 16, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee* — Navy and Army Expenditure (1863-4)*; Colonial Docks Loans*; Carriers Act Amendment.*

Ordered—Colonial Docks Loans*; Carriers Act Amendment*; Turnpike Acts Continuance*; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements.*

First Reading — Carriers Act Amendment* [224]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangement* [225]; Colonial Docks Loans* [226]; Turnpike Acts Continuance* [227].

Second Reading — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [215]; Harbours Transfer* [216]; Falmouth Borough.*

Committee — Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment (*re-comm.*) [187]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) (*re-comm.*)* [168]; Trusts Administration (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [158]; Crown Suits, &c. (*re-comm.*)* [206]; Parsonages* [205] [*Lords*]; Pheasants (Ireland* [193] [*Lords*].

Report—Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment (*re-comm.*) [187]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2)* (*re-comm.*) [168]; Trusts Administration (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [158]; Crown Suits, &c.* (*re-comm.*) [206]; Parsonages* [205] [*Lords*]; Pheasants (Ireland)* [193] [*Lords*].

Considered as amended — Kingstown Harbour* [185].

Third Reading—Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased)* [189]; Naval and Marine (Pay and Pensions)* [190]; Penalties Law Amendment [213].

Withdrawn — Arrests for Debt Abolition (Ireland)* [126].

SOUTH KENSINGTON NEW ROAD BILL.

COMMITTEE.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR moved that this Bill should be re-committed to the former Committee, and that they should proceed therewith on Monday next. The object was to make a broad road in the vicinity of Belgrave Square and the Brompton Road, near the South Kensington Museum, the length being about half a mile, and the minimum width eighty feet. That would require about eighteen acres, but the Commissioners proposed that it should be 150 feet wide, and for that purpose thirty acres would be wanted. The Estimate for the road simply was £220,000, but the capital to be taken for the whole of the improvements was £1,000,000 sterling, with debenture power beyond. The accidents which occurred at the time of the Great Exhibition, consequent upon the great amount of traffic through the present narrow thoroughfares, made it only surprising that the road had not been earlier made, and there was no doubt from the evidence taken before the Committee that the traffic since that time rendered the carrying out of the improvements contemplated by the Bill a very desirable object. The Chairman of the Committee himself had stated that sufficient witnesses had been called to prove the desirability of the new road. With regard to the objection to a private company carrying out the improvement, the ratepayers were already sufficiently taxed, the Board of Works, whose duty it was to carry out the improvement, had not the means of doing so, and the House had already affirmed the principle of empowering private persons to carry out public improvements, and for their own advantage, in the case of the Hyde Park Estate Gate Bill. It had been complained that the company had attempted to obtain too much land for the object proposed ; but, in the case of Victoria Street, the construction of which was undertaken by a private company, the public suffered and the company became bankrupt entirely in consequence of insufficient land being taken ; and, in the case of the Thames Embankment, the Board of Works were empowered to schedule a larger quantity of land than was absolutely required, in order that they might recoup themselves for the outlay. But the Committee, nevertheless, came to the conclusion that the company asked for more land than was wanted ; and it was for the purpose of requiring them to reconsider that decision that he brought forward the present Motion. The directors of the company for making this road included the names of Mr. E. Wortley, M.P., Mr. Warner, M.P., Mr. Knight (of the firm of Smith, Knight, and Co.), Mr. Montague Baillie, and Mr. Astley, of Eaton Place, and the security for its completion comprised the Crédit Foncier and Mobilier of England, with its capital of £2,000,000, and Messrs. Smith and Knight, with a paid-up capital of the same amount. The value of the property to be affected was £800,000, and the opponents only represented property to the amount of £20,000. The opponents were principally shopkeepers in the Brompton Road, who thought that the sale of their goods would be injured by people leaving the high road, and going by the wide street. There were some dwellings of the labouring classes which would be displaced, but if the poor desired to live in the midst of the rich they must be content to live, as in Paris, on floors of tall houses. The vestries of Chelsea and Kensington supported the measure, ten Members of Parliament had signed petitions in its favour, and he believed it was desired by the inhabitants of Belgravia generally.

MR. H. BAILLIE seconded the Motion, and said this was one of those improvements which was originally designed by the Prince Consort, and if the Bill were not passed this Session, it must inevitably be carried during next year. Although the promoters of the Bill were not capitalists they were supported by a great financial company, which entered into agreement with them to carry out the measure in the event of the Bill passing. A clause might be inserted in the Bill compelling the company to build model lodging-houses for the accommodation of those whom they turned out of their homes.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the South Kensington New Road Bill be re-committed to the former Committee, and that they do proceed therewith upon Monday next."—(*Mr. Henry Seymour.*)

VISCOUNT GALWAY said, he must, as Chairman of the Committee, oppose the Motion. It was unfair that when a Committee unanimously rejected a Bill a Member of this House should come down and seek to get it re-committed. He denied that the Committee had stopped the case. They had simply intimated that witnesses should not be called to prove again and again the same point. The Committee did not think that sufficient evidence had been adduced to justify the interference with property which would be involved. The Committee objected to granting forty-five acres for the purpose of making an ornamented street which only required fifteen acres. This Bill was one of the weakest and worst supported that had ever come under his notice. In the case of the Hyde Park Estate Gate Bill, that came from the House of Lords and was sanctioned by the Committee. The Committee were the best judges of the expediency of passing such a Bill. It was a positive fact that the opponents of the measure could not find out who were its promoters. The total capital of the company was to be £1,000,000, and no proof had been adduced that they would be able to raise that sum. The proposal would involve the removal of the houses of a large number of poor people, and would inflict upon them a considerable amount of inconvenience and hardship. Not an architect was produced to speak of the mode of laying down the proposed line. Nor were there any witnesses to prove the sufficiency of the estimates. Lord Cadogan, the chief landowner in the neighbourhood, petitioned against the Bill. The householders, who held leases of from fifteen to sixty years, had spent large sums in improving their property, for which, if handed over to the tender mercies of the Crédit Foncier, they would have no prospect of adequate compensation. He voted for the second reading of the Bill, because it had come from the Lords.

Mr. J. PEEL said, that though as a Member of the Committee he felt the road would be a great public convenience, there were reasons which led the Committee to a strong opinion that the measure ought not to be sanctioned.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that it was at all times undesirable, except in very strong cases, to encourage appeals to the House from the decision of Committees, but that was more particularly the case at a late period of the Session, with respect to a Bill which was strongly opposed, and when the Committee was unanimous.

Mr. SCOURFIELD said, he should oppose the Motion, on the ground that it would be an extremely dangerous precedent to hand over private property to a company like the Crédit Foncier, which had no connection with the locality to which the measure related. It was also a very objectionable process, and one calculated to bring discredit upon Parliament, to sanction Bills before the companies were formed. The scheme was promoted by strangers who had no claims to it. If such applications were allowed, no man's house would be his castle whenever a company got up a little capital for the purpose of turning him out.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that in consequence of the late period of the Session, he consented to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *witdrawn.*

SALMON FISHERY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT (*re-committed*) BILL.

[BILL 187.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 26 were *agreed to.*

Clause 27 (Enumeration of Powers of Board of Conservators).

Viscount Gallway

Earl PERCY moved, in section 1, line 8, after "appointed," to add—

> "Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the said Board of Conservators from obtaining the services of additional constables under the Act third and fourth Victoria, chapter eighty-eight, section nineteen, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act; such constables, when appointed, to have all the powers and privileges of water bailiffs, and to be paid for their services by the said Board."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 28, Clause F (Power of Conservators as to Eel Fisheries).

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK moved the omission of the Clause, which he said provided that between the 1st of January and the 1st of July no eels were to be taken, the ground being that the boxes and gratings used for taking them were liable to catch salmon. Eels were a very important article of food in England; and in the south of England at all events were best in the spring and summer. There had been no evidence given upon this subject before the Committee, and therefore he objected to their legislating upon the matter at present.

Mr. KNIGHT said, he seconded the Amendment. Nothing was more destructive to salmon than eels, and therefore the more eels were caught the better would it be for the preservation of the salmon in those places.

Mr. BARING said, he was willing, if this regulation would interfere with the eel fishery, to omit the clause.

Clause *struck out.*

Clauses 29 to 31 were *agreed to.*

Clause 32 (Order for Entry of Water-Bailiff on Land).

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he moved its omission, on the ground that it involved a proposition contrary to the first principles of English law. The clause appeared to be founded upon the supposition that every owner of a salmon fishery was a criminal, for it gave the conservator or water bailiff power, after making oath before a justice of the peace that he suspected acts in contravention of the Fishery Act, to enter, go over, and remain seven days upon, a gentleman's land without being liable to a charge of trespass.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, he hoped that the clause would be retained, as, from his experience of the Irish Salmon Fishery Act, he believed that it would be exceedingly useful in preventing abuse, and that the power it conferred would not be likely to be abused.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to,* with the exception of Clauses 56 and 66, which were *negatived.*

Mr. T. G. BARING moved the following clause:—

(Provisions as to exportation of salmon.)

"All salmon intended for exportation shall be entered for that purpose with the proper officer of Customs, at the port or place of intended exportation, before shipment thereof; and any salmon shipped or exported, or brought to any wharf, quay, or other place for exportation, contrary to this section, shall be forfeited, and the person shipping or exporting or bringing the same for exportation shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding two pounds for every salmon so shipped or exported or brought for exportation; and any officer of the Customs may, between the third day of September and the second day of February, open any parcel entered or intended for exportation, or brought to any quay, wharf, or other place for that purpose, and suspected by him to contain salmon, and may detain any salmon found in such parcel until proof is given, in manner provided by law, of the salmon being such as may be legally exported; and, if the salmon before such proof is given become unfit for human food, the officer of Customs may destroy the same."

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* on *Tuesday* next, and to be *printed* [Bill 220.]

OWNERLESS DOGS.—QUESTION.

Mr. DAWSON DAMER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, to prevent accidents from ownerless dogs in the Metropolis and its environs (four persons having been yesterday bitten by such dogs), he does not think it advisable to bring in a Bill for the destruction by the police, by strychnine or other means, of all dogs going about without collars and the addresses of their owners thereon?

Sir GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that by the Metropolitan Police Act constables were authorized to destroy all dogs that were suspected to be in a rabid state, and the owners of dogs which were known to be dangerous were liable to penalties for allowing them to be at large. Whether any other measures ought to be adopted to prevent evil arising from the number of dogs in the streets he was not at that moment prepared to say. It might be desirable that dogs at large in the streets should wear muzzles, which, while not confining their mouths so as to drive them mad, might prevent them from doing any injury. He did not think that any great security would be given to the public by merely requiring that every dog should have round his neck a collar bearing the name and address of his owner.

ARMY—REGIMENTAL PAYMASTERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. SURTEES said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to confer the rank of Lieutenant Colonel upon Regimental Paymasters of twenty years service, considering that by the promotion of Surgeons to that and higher ranks since the year 1858 Paymasters have lost that position of equality with the Surgeons in their Regiments which they had previously enjoyed; and, if not, for what reason?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, in reply, that there was at present no intention to alter the rank of Paymasters as suggested by the hon. Gentleman. The whole question of relative rank was considered by Lord Herbert in 1860, when the Warrant which fixed the rank of Paymasters was settled; and that noble Lord objected to adopt the measure indicated by the hon. Gentleman for several reasons into which he (the Marquess of Hartington) need not enter. One reason, which had considerable weight with Lord Herbert, was that there had never been any difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of well-qualified Paymasters, while there had been considerable difficulty in getting properly qualified Army Surgeons. Paymasters were not the only Officers who might complain that their relative rank was altered by that which was conferred upon Surgeons by the Medical Warrant of 1858.

ARMY — THE ARMSTRONG AND WHITWORTH GUNS.—QUESTION.

Mr. H. BAILLIE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the Report of the Armstrong and Whitworth Committee on the 12-pounder Guns has been referred to another Committee appointed by the War Office, and if so, for what purpose?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, in reply, that after the Report of the Committee on the 12-pounder Armstrong and Whitworth guns had been sent to the Commander-in-Chief for his consideration, a 12-pounder Whitworth gun had been sent by his desire to Woolwich to be placed in the hands of the Artillery, and to be treated in the same way as the service guns were ordinarily treated in drill practice. No doubt that, after it had undergone a certain amount of trial, it would be reported upon by the Commandant of Woolwich, and probably some other officers; but it was not the fact that any Committee had been appointed to consider the Report of the Armstrong and Whitworth Committee. The only point upon which the opinion of the Woolwich authorities was asked was, as to the weight and convenience of the gun, and no experiments as to its merits would be carried out by them.

DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND).—QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he has any objection to state if the Irish Government, before appointing persons to the office of Resident Physician to the District Lunatic Asylums, requires satisfactory proof that they have acquired a practical knowledge of the treatment of insanity; and whether candidates are examined as to their fitness to be entrusted with the care and treatment of the insane by the Inspectors of Asylums, and a Report made thereon to the Lord Lieutenant.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, in reply, that full and ample inquiry was always made as to the efficiency of the medical men appointed to Lunatic Asylums. He might mention that on a recent occasion the former Resident Physician of the Waterford Asylum was appointed to the Asylum at Castlebar, and the vacancy thus created had been filled, or was about to be filled, by the appointment of Dr. M'Kay, a gentleman whom the hon. Member himself had very strongly recommended. The Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums always endeavoured to obtain accurate information as to the qualifications of future Resident Physicians before the appointments were made by the Government.

UNITED STATES—CONSULS FOR THE SOUTHERN STATES.—QUESTION.

Mr. HADFIELD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether and when the Government intends to replace English Consuls at the ports on the seaboard of the Southern States of North America (such as Charleston, Savannah, &c.), declared by the President to be open for general commerce on 1st July next; and whether the same Consuls who occupied those several stations before the war, and were acquainted with the interests involved, will be again sent out.

Mr. LAYARD said, in reply, that British Consuls who had been long resident in the Southern ports were either actually upon the spot or shortly would be. The Consuls who before the war were stationed at New Orleans and Savannah, had died, and their places had been already filled; the Consul at Galveston never left his post; the Consul at Charleston had been promoted to be Consul General at Cuba, but the Vice Consul who succeeded him had never been absent. The Consul at Mobile had been removed to another station, and was no longer in the service; but the gentleman actually in charge of the Consulate had been out there during the whole of the war.

Mr. CHEETHAM said, he wished to know when the Consuls would enter upon their duties.

Mr. LAYARD replied, on the 1st of July, when the ports were open.

IRISH RECORDS.—QUESTION.

Colonel FRENCH said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the removal of the Irish Records to the new building in Dublin will take place, and what steps have been taken to assimilate that establishment to the one existing in England.

Mr. PEEL, in reply, said, the removal of the Irish Records could not take place till the new building was ready to receive them, which would not be until the month of October. No definite plan had yet been adopted, but probably it would be found advisable to form a Record Establishment on principles similar to those followed in this country.

ARMY — THE ARMSTRONG GUN COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he rose to ask, Whether the Report of the Armstrong Gun Commission will be laid on the Table before the end of the Session.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said the third part of the Report in question—namely, that relating to 12-pounders—was the only portion yet received, and as it would hardly be convenient to produce this by itself, the Report, he apprehended, could not be laid on the table before the end of the present Session.

THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the Licence to be granted to the Convocation of Canterbury for the alteration of the Canon of Subscription, will be laid on the table?

SIR GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, it would take some time to make it out. He could not, therefore, say the exact day.

MR. WHITESIDE said, he wished to know if it were likely to be laid on the table before his Motion on the subject came on for discussion.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he could not say.

MR. WHITESIDE: Are we to have it before the dissolution?

SUPPLY.

Order for Committe read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

DOCKYARD SUPERINTENDENTS.

RESOLUTION.

MR. SEELY, in introducing the Motion of which he had given notice regarding the appointment of Dockyard Superintendents, said, the Admiralty had the power of going to the same market with other shipbuilding establishments for their materials, and he could only come to the conclusion that the reason why the work was to the amount of from half a million to a million a year more expensively done in the Royal dockyards than was necessary was on account of the mismanagement prevailing in them. It could scarcely be expected that the Lords of the Admiralty, considering the rank from which they were taken, would have any practical knowledge of shipbuilding, but it might be reasonably expected that they would take care to appoint persons enjoying that knowledge which they themselves did not possess. He would briefly examine the securities taken for the efficient and economical management of the dockyards. The first gentleman appointed was the Controller, who, as a seaman, could have no practical knowledge of shipbuilding. Yet the duties of the Controller of the Navy were to control all expenditure in building, repair, and outfit of ships both in dockyards and contract vessels, including machinery; to state the number of men for each department; to regulate the number according to wages Vote; to recommend alteration of numbers; to revise expenditure with a view to economy and efficiency; to visit the yards, inspect work, and see that his orders are carried out well; to recommend means of preserving ships, learn their condition, and that of boilers and machinery, so that he may tell their Lordships when they will be ready for sea. To see that the timber is good and suitable; and as to the quantity in store, to carefully observe the quantity of timber and stores so as to report at once any want or waste thereof, to receive and examine monthly a scheme of the progress of work at each yard, and to modify such work when needed; to submit, when required, designs of vessels to be built by Admiralty or contract, with details of cost, machinery and guns proposed; for contract vessels, to give the names of contractors, and other details. It was perfectly impossible that a man, even possessing the most intimate acquaintance with shipbuilding, could discharge all these duties without efficient subordinates. The next step to secure efficiency in the dockyards was the appointment of Superintendents, gentlemen invariably taken from among the officers of the Royal Navy. It was not his wish to confine such appointments to civilians, but if given by preference to officers of the navy it ought to be seen that they possessed the requisite qualifications. They should not be excluded, but the most competent men, whether sailors or civilians, should be selected to control and direct the expenditure of the Royal dockyards. The Duke of Somerset said of the Captain Superintendent—

> "He is a naval officer put there to superintend all the different departments that are under him. He cannot be practically acquainted with shipbuilding. He is in a worse position, in point of knowledge, than the Controller is with regard to the Superintendent who is under him. The Controller has been for many years in the situation, whereas the Superintendents in the dockyards are removed every five years, and therefore cannot be expected to be practically conversant with shipbuilding or the details of manufactures that are now going on in the dockyards."

In other words, it was more pleasant for one ignorant man to give his orders to another ignorant man than for an ignorant man to give his orders to one who was possessed of knowledge. It was also stated of the Superintendents—

> "Their hands are very much tied by 'instructions.' All officers of every grade are subordinate to them. They are required to use the utmost zeal and diligence in seeing orders of the Board carried out, and must exercise 'as far as possible a personal supervision over every part of the establishment committed to their care.' Can 'discharge workmen for misconduct,' but 'have no direct control over the expenditure of the yards,' and 'the number of workmen, the rate of wages, and the distribution of labour are arranged in London.'"

They could not, therefore, be expected to exercise an efficient control over an expenditure of £2,000,000. The next in rank was the master shipwright. They were in some cases very able men, but they were not placed in a position to insure efficiency and economy in these yards. The master shipwrights, moreover, only had the direction of one department; the chief engineer had another; and the master attendant a third. Every one knew that for a manufacturing business to be conducted properly there must be one controlling head in a position of authority, and possessing power proportionate to his responsibility. The master shipwright was not in that position. He would name an instance in point, and that an important one. Many of the improvements in private manufacturing departments took their origin from the working men. If a man in the Royal dockyards thought he saw a thing might be done better and more cheaply he communicated to the foreman. The latter went to the head of the department—say, the master shipwright. He went to the Superintendent. The matter then went to Somerset House, and thence finally to Whitehall. After great delay the communication travelled back downwards to the Superintendent, and so on, unless, indeed, the communication was lost by the way. The master shipwright had to touch his hat to every officer in uniform, naval or military, whom he might meet in the yard. He was insufficiently paid for a man who had charge of so many thousand men. In private establishments such a man would receive nearly the salary of a Cabinet Minister. There were at the present moment men who were superintending private building yards, who were paid nearly as well as the First Lord of the Treasury, and yet the Government expected that a master shipwright with a salary of £600 a year and a retiring allowance would do for them what private firms paid from £2,000 to £4,000 a year to obtain. The thing was ridiculous. The master shipwright was the head of only one department, and he was not in a position to secure the right management and control of the Royal dockyards. The system was also productive of jealousies. The master shipwright and the chief engineer sometimes could not agree, and they had to refer their differences to the Superintendent, who knew nothing about the matter. It was, therefore, highly essential that an officer who knew something about the business of the dockyards should be placed at the head of them. If any private business were managed like the dockyards the principals would come to bankruptcy and inevitable ruin. He was sorry to have to trouble the House with figures, but matters of account could not be dealt with without them. His object was to show the great waste in the management of the Royal dockyards; and as the House was the guardian of the public purse, and it was dealing with an expenditure of more than £2,000,000, he would ask for the patient indulgence of the House for a few minutes. He would first refer to "Return No. 454 on Dockyards and Steam Factories for 1862-3," the last Return published. This Return gave the following results:—

> "Chatham Boathouses.—25 boats fitted, cost £10 6*s.* 5*d.*, equal to £258 0*s.* 2*d.*; ditto rate-book price, £23 2*s.* 1¼, equal to £577 13*s.*; cost less than rate-book, £12 6*s.* 8¼*d.*, equal to £319 12*s.* 10*d.*"
>
> "Portsmouth Boathouses.—85 boats fitted, cost £18 15*s.*, equal to £1,593 14*s.* 8*d.*; ditto, rate-book value, £9 5*s.* 8½*d.*, equal to £799 6*s.*; cost more than rate-book, £10 10*s.* 4½*d.*, equal to £794 8*s.* 8*d.*"

Thus at Chatham boats were fitted out at half the rate-book price, while at Portsmouth they cost double the rate-book price, or four times as much as at Chatham, according to the rate-book. He would not say that these accounts were accurate, but they were the accounts furnished by the Admiralty, and it was for the Admiralty to explain them. He would now advert to the smitheries of the Royal dockyards. On a former occasion he had called attention to the cost of forging in the Royal dockyards—a subject in which he took some interest, since he happened to be connected with works of this kind. With one or two friends he paid a visit to Chatham, and satisfied himself that the system of forging in the Royal dockyards was most extravagant. On looking to the cost of the different yards he found these results. He was still referring to Return 454 — Dockyard and Steam Factories, 1862-3—

"Sheerness Smitheries.—Common Forgings.—1,679 cwt., cost 27*s*. 6½*d*. per cwt., equal to £2,314 ; rate-book value, 21*s*. per cwt., equal to £1,763 ; cost more than rate-book, £551.

"Devonport Smitheries.—Common Forgings.—3,503 cwt., cost 16*s*. 3½*d*. per cwt., equal to £2,856 ; rate-book value, 21*s*. per cwt., equal to £3,678 ; cost less than rate-book, £822.

"Portsmouth Smitheries.—Plain Forgings.—2,488 cwt., cost 47*s*. 1½*d*. per cwt., equal to £5,864 ; rate-book value 35*s*. per cwt., equal to £4,354 ; cost more than rate-book, £1,510.

"Devonport Smitheries.—Plain Forgings.—2,250 cwt., cost 33*s*. 0¼*d*. per cwt., equal to £3,715 ; rate-book value, 35*s*. per cwt., equal to £3,939 ; cost less than rate-book, £224.

"Portsmouth Smitheries.—Middling Forgings.—1,992 cwt., cost 58*s*. 0¾*d*. per cwt., equal to £5,785 ; rate-book value, 44*s*. 2*d*. per cwt., equal to £4,400 ; cost more than rate-book, £1,385.

"Devonport Smitheries.—Middling Forgings.—2,234 cwt., cost 44*s*. 11¾*d*. per cwt., equal to £5,026 ; rate-book price, 44*s*. 2*d*. per cwt., equal to £4,934 ; cost more than rate-book, only £92.

"Portsmouth Smitheries.—Extra Forgings.—727 cwt.; cost 129*s*. per cwt., equal to £4,696 ; rate-book price, 70*s*. equal to £2,547 ; cost more than rate-book, £2,149.

"Sheerness Smitheries.—Extra Forgings.—422 cwt., cost 62*s*. 7¾*d*. per cwt., equal to £1,322 ; rate-book price, 70*s*. per cwt., equal to £1,490 ; cost less than rate-book, £168.

He wished he could spare the House these figures, and hand them to the reporters to be read to-morrow morning.

"In the Portsmouth steam-hammer shops, 3,777 cwt. blanks cost 31*s*. 9¾*d*. per cwt., equal to £6,010 ; at the rate-book price of 20*s*. per cwt., equal to £3,778 ; cost more than rate-book £2,232. In the Devonport steam-hammer shops, 2,813 cwt. blanks cost 14*s*. 8¾*d*. per cwt., equal to £2,072 ; rate-book price was 20*s*. per cwt. equal to £2,813 ; cost less than rate-book was £741. Total cost of blanks at all the yards—17,757 cwt. cost 23*s*. per cwt., equal to £20,570 ; 17,757 cwt. Devonport rate, cost 14*s*. 8½*d*. per cwt., equal to £13,140 ; excess of cost above Devonport rate was £7,427, or more than 50 per cent."

He would spare the House any further figures under this head. He called attention some time ago to the conversions of timber in the dock yards ; his figures had never been disputed, and his facts had never been denied. He showed on that occasion the conversion of timber in the years 1862-3, and that if all conversions had been effected at the lowest yard rates, there would have been a saving in that one year of £55,496. The excess of offal timber made in 1862-3, over the rate given by Mr. Llewellyn in his evidence before the Dockyard Commission as the rate actually made at Devonport dockyard, from 1850 to 1854, was 202,672 cubic feet. The difference in value of this as timber or offal was £37,760, so there was loss to that amount. English elm sawmills' conversions at Sheerness cost less than the rate-book 29 per cent, while at Devonport English elm sawmills' conversions cost £1,469, the rate-book value being only £513 ; the cost more than the rate-book was therefore 186 per cent, or £956. In 1859 a Committee, which had been appointed to inquire into the dockyards, issued a Report in which was this paragraph, "that small separate workshops are most objectionable, and are at present too general throughout the yards." In corroboration of that he would say that, according to Return 432, Dockyard and Steam Factories, 1861-2, at the Chatham Lead Mills, the labour and expenses in making 11,730 cwt of milled lead from ingot metal at the dockyards was 2*s*. 6*d*. per cwt., a total of £1,466 ; the cost or difference between ingot and milled lead in the market would be 3*d*. per cwt., equal to £146 ; difference or loss through the Admiralty making milled lead was £1,320. The labour and expenses in making 3,322 cwt. pipe lead at the dockyards was 4*s*. 10*d*. per cwt., equal to £802; the cost or difference in price between ingot and pipe in the market was 3*d*. per cwt., equal to £42 ; difference or loss to the Admiralty was thus £760. The total loss to the Admiralty in 1861-2 was therefore £2,080. In 1862-3 the labour, &c., cost the Admiralty for making milled lead from ingot 1*s*. 8½*d*. per cwt., market price or difference being 3*d*. per cwt. (reckoning ingot at market price 20*s*. 3*d*., no data being given in Admiralty accounts) ; thus occasioning a loss in 1862-3 of £1,090 ; which, added to the loss in 1861-2, makes the total loss 1861-2, 1862-3, amount to £3,170. In 1861-2, ingot lead bought at Chatham cost about 20*s*. 5½*d*. ; cost at market, 20*s*. 3*d*. per cwt. Milled lead cost at Chatham, 23*s*. 11½*d*. ; cost at market, 20*s*. 6*d*.; cost of labour, &c., at Chatham, 2*s*. 6*d*. per cwt.; cost of labour, &c., at market, 3*d*. per cwt. Pipe lead cost at Chatham, 25*s*. 3½*d*. per cwt. ; cost at market 20*s*. 6*d*. ; cost of labour, &c., at Chatham, 4*s*. 10*d*. per cwt. ; cost of labour, &c., at market, 3*d*. per cwt. Labour, &c., Admiralty milled, 11 times market price; labour, &c., Admiralty pipe, 20 times market price. Ingot being 20*s*. 3*d*. in 1862-3, it would appear that the Admiralty rate-book value of labour, &c, for milled was 1*s*. 9*d*. per cwt., the market value *3d.*; Admiralty rate-book value labour, &c., pipe, *7s. 3d.*, market value *3d.* per cwt. for whatever price ingot may be in the market; milled and pipe lead are *3d.* per cwt. higher. It would scarcely be contended that the Admiralty could not have gone to the open market and bought pipes quite as good as they could manufacture them. And now he came to another point. For the year 1865-6 the House had voted £30,336 for police for watching and guarding the naval yards; 16,694 workmen were employed in them, and therefore each one of those men cost about *36s.* and *4d.* for watching and guarding him. A Committee had lately been appointed by the Admiralty and had gone round various yards. His hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) no doubt, had some communication with that Committee, and perhaps he would tell the House whether the Committee had found anything like £4,000 or £5,000 a year spent in watching the different private yards. If not, perhaps the hon. Gentleman would favour the House with the reason why the workmen in the Royal yards required such an enormous amount of police force to watch and guard them. He now came to another subject connected with the question of superintendence, because, if we had practical men of business at the head of our establishments, they would take care that nothing was bought at an extravagant price. He had asked for a Return of the price lately paid for anchors, in continuation of a Return published in 1859. That Return had been laid upon the table, and he found that they were now paying for anchors from 100 cwt. to 120 cwt., *60s.* per cwt., while the average price of four makers was *33s. 8d.* For anchors from 70 cwt. to 100 cwt, the Admiralty paid *56s. 6d.* the average price of the four makers being *33s. 4d.* And so on down to anchors of 20 cwt., for which the Admiralty paid *26s. 6d.*, while the price of the four makers was *23s. 11d.* The average price paid by the Admiralty for all sizes was *45s. 3d.*, while the average price of the four makers was only *28s.* He calculated from a Return just printed (1859 to 1864) that 25,400 cwt. cost the Admiralty £60,330; the same size anchors bought in open market would cost £36,458, the difference or loss being £23,872. In 1856-7 the Admiralty anchors cost £44,856; in 1855-6 they cost £51,553. The Admiralty price, then, of one of each of five sizes from 20cwt. to 95 cwt was £237 *5s.*; the market price for same was £127. If these anchors, bought from 1855 to 1857, were all Admiralty patterns the loss in two years was £40,000, and therefore there would have been a saving to the country for those two years, if we bought the anchors in the open market, of that large sum. An hon. Friend below him asked "What about the quality?" Upon that point a letter which he received from Mr. H. P. Parkes, of Tipton Green Chain and Anchor Works, would be the best answer. It was as follows:—

> "Sir,—Below I have much pleasure in forwarding my present price list for Admiralty pattern anchors, made in exact conformity with the Admiralty regulations, specifications, proofs, finish, &c., identically the same as now required for the Royal Navy. I have lately completed, under official inspection of an officer from Woolwich Dockyard, a contract for Admiralty plan anchors of considerable extent for the Ottoman Government. Chain makers and anchor smiths are a migratory class working for all makers alike who have work for them to do, and many in my employ at this moment have for years previously been employed at the works of the Admiralty contractors. The supply of Admiralty plan anchors for the Royal navy has been for near a quarter of a century notoriously an exclusive monopoly in the hands of one favoured firm (Messrs. Brown, Lennox and Co.), who have also the sole supply of chain cables for the navy. How this is, or why, has always been a most mysterious affair to myself and the whole trade."

The average price furnished by Mr. Parkes was *28s.* per cwt. He should be extremely glad if the noble Lord could explain why a price nearly approaching 100 per cent extra was paid by the Admiralty for their anchors. In the Report of the Royal Commission of 1861 the following reason was given by Mr. Thomas Lloyd, Engineer-in-Chief of the Navy, for approving the Admiralty building iron ships:—

> "If for no other, to make a comparison between the cost of a ship built in one of Her Majesty's dockyards and the price at which one can be purchased, and to make a comparison also between the quality of those two ships."

It would be highly desirable that the Admiralty should take notice of the prices at which the work in the private yards was done. The Admiralty had omitted £1,000,000 a year from their calculation of the cost to the country of the building and repairing of ships. They had left out many items which would be charged in the calculations of a private firm. For instance, he found that in 1863-4 they had omitted £214,800 (which the Government said would be included for the future). The salaries of foremen, rent, cost of gas, &c., amounted to £214,800. The pensions to artificers and to officers and foremen amounted—the foremen to £73,396; the latter to, say, £60,000. Besides these items it was necessary, in comparing the expenditure of the Royal with that of the public yards, to set down something for interest upon plant and capital. Now the stock of stores was about £5,000,000; the expenditure on shipbuilding for ships in progress of building up to March, 1864, was £1,117,713; on ships commenced as wooden and converted into iron-cased ships while building, £1,338,982. He assumed that in the seven Royal yards there had been expended on plant, workshops, and machinery, at least £2,000,000. [An hon. MEMBER: More!] Very likely; but he wished to state a moderate sum. According to this Estimate the total capital and plant was, therefore, £9,456,695; and the interest on this would be, at 5 per cent, £472,835. This would make a total of £821,031, which must be added to the cost of ships in 1863-4. Again, from the years 1855 to 1865-6, there was spent upon new works, machinery, &c., £1,342,000. This was entirely for the building and repairing of ships, and would represent an average of £122,000 a year. In the same period £5,709,578. was spent on new works, buildings, machinery, and repairs, which would give an average of £519,052 a year. As he had said, the whole sum, including interest on capital, which must be added to the cost of ships in 1863-4, was £821,031. This was excluding every part of the enormous sum spent yearly on new works, machinery, &c., and also the sum of £166,881 for Admiralty Offices in respect of which a sum of £82,306 ought to be charged to ships. Omitting these items, however, the House would see what would be the effect if the £821,000 were apportioned among the ships built and repaired by the Admiralty. The total expenditure on vessels in 1863-4 was £2,848,397, from which deduct cost of ships built by contract, £585,361, leaving cost of ships built and repaired by the Admiralty £2,263,036. To this must be added items not reckoned in Admiralty accounts — namely, £821,031, so that 40 per cent has to be added to these accounts in 1863-4 for purpose of comparison; £958,106, or 45 per cent, in 1862-3; £1,035,216, or 40 per cent in 1861-2; and £1,038,561, or 35 per cent in 1860-1. So that the ships built at Her Majesty's dockyards, which the accounts gave as costing about £2,000,000 each year, really cost about £3,000,000, or £1,000,000 per year additional. And now, what was the effect of that calculation upon the repairs of ships, a subject brought by him before the House on a former occasion? The *Wasp*, built in 1850, was a ship of 13 guns, 974 tons, and 100-horse power. According to the published accounts her repairs in 1859-60 cost £7,253. Adding 40 per cent, the real cost of her repairs would be £10,154. In 1860-1 her repairs cost, according to the Admiralty accounts, £8,483; adding 35 per cent, they really cost £11,452. In 1863-4 her repairs cost £32,002; add 40 per cent, and the real cost of her repairs would be, in 1863-4 alone, £44,802. Deducting £1,566 for returns, the total net cost of the ship in repairs since 1859 was set down at £46,172; but, adding the percentage stated, which would also be according to the mode in which private firms would deal with accounts, the real cost would be £64,842. Yet this wooden vessel, which could neither fight nor run away, might be bought new for £39,590. He had made the same calculations with regard to five other vessels, but he would not trouble the House with the details. The result was that, according to the published accounts, these six ships cost for repairs from 1859 to the present time £212,859, or, adding the percentages, £292,826, and they could have been bought new for £220,215. These were points which in a commercial country like this ought to be explained, but as to which he had sought in vain for an explanation from practical men. He came now to another matter. In 1863-4 the *Sharpshooter*, a 6-gun vessel of 503 tons and 102 horse-power, cost for repair of her machinery, with incidental expenses, £9,220. Adding 40 per cent to this, the repairs of the machinery amounted in one year to £13,000. But new engines and machinery might have been bought at £55 per horse-power for £5,610. The House and the country ought to know who was responsible for these things, which could not happen if practical men were at the head of our large manufacturing establishments. He believed that the Admiralty at present wasted every year nearly a million of money, and he wanted to know why it was so wasted. He had shown as to six ships that their repairs from 1859 had cost, without any additional percentage, £212,859; while they could have been bought new for £220,215. The hulls of vessels built in the Royal yards from 1860 to 1864 cost, according to the published accounts, from £24 10*s*. 3*d*. to £32 15*s*. 3*d*. per ton; while, in the private yards, in 1861 the hulls contracted for cost from £21 19*s* to £23 15*s*. per ton. Then he might fairly assume that the Admiralty had not built those hulls or executed those repairs at a less cost, according to its own published accounts, than they could have been done for in private yards. It was clear, then, that the £821,000 was utterly wasted, unless there was some special reason why the country should spend annually nearly a million more than would be spent in private yards in doing the same thing. The Admiralty and the private trade went to the same market for materials and labour; the Admiralty had an unlimited supply of capital, and the only ground of difference was, in his opinion, the mismanagement of details. He thought he knew the argument by which he should be met. It would be said that the work was done well in the Royal dockyards, and he admitted that in one sense it was done well. The materials were sound, the workmanship was substantial; but there was an almost unanimous condemnation of the Admiralty with regard to their mode of the construction of ships. It was very much a question whether, putting these large engines into wooden vessels, making them screw vessels, was not a great mistake. If we had practical men of business in the dockyards to assist the Admiralty we should be in a much better position than we were. The second argument was, that these Superintendents had other things to do besides building and repairing ships. If so, let the House know what those things were. He maintained that a man practically acquainted with shipbuilding was better fitted to superintend the manufacture of ships than a man who knew nothing about it. If they put two or three millions a year into the hands of Government to expend they should have practical men to disburse it. Perhaps his noble Friend would say that it was a saving to the country to have a superior officer in a Royal dockyard when a vessel came in for repairs; for the captain of the vessel, if he had only to deal with an inferior officer, would put the country to expense for unnecessary repairs. Now, he contended that a practical shipbuilder or practical engineer was better able to know what repairs a ship wanted than a naval officer. A civilian in the position of a manager of the works, like Mr. Lumley at the establishment at Millwall, with which the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay) was connected, was less likely to listen to a naval officer who desired something unreasonable to be done than another naval officer whose tenure of office might be about to expire. It was said the other night that some twelve or thirteen private firms took naval officers to superintend their concerns; but he had made inquiries on the point, and he could only find that two naval officers were at all engaged in these matters—the hon. and gallant Member for Wakefield and Captain Symonds—and they each, he believed, occupied the position of a director in a company, and employed a practical shipbuilder as manager. He believed that no man could be found in a manufacturing town to state that at the head of a large manufacturing business there should be placed a man who knew nothing about it. With regard to authority, there were on the one side the Duke of Somerset, the noble Lord (Lord Clarence Paget), and the hon. Member (Mr. Childers); in opposition to those authorities he placed almost every man in that House, Sir Richard Bromley, Sir Baldwin Walker, the Royal Commissioners, and the Committee of 1859, who emphatically stated in their Report that practical men only should be appointed to positions requiring practical experience. He held in his hand a note from Mr. Beaumont, a Member of the Committee of 1859, in which that Gentleman most emphatically stated his opinion that at present the Superintendents in Her Majesty's dockyards were not only of no use, but a hindrance. But he had higher authority, and that was the authority of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who at Chester the other day argued that a profession should be taken to when a person was young, and should be carried on by a man who knew something about it. He illustrated that doctrine by saying that a smith or a carpenter would not engage a man who was ignorant of those trades, and who was too old to learn. He considered this applicable to these Superintendents, they were too old to learn; the Admiralty, both the present and preceding Boards, were perfectly aware of the mismanagement that prevailed; and they were trailing a red herring across the path by appointing Committees and calling for Reports and recommendations. They began in 1796 to appoint Committees, and they have been appointing Committees ever since. They had a Committee last year to inquire into the accounts, though they might have gone into the City and got a professional accountant to do what they wanted. They appointed a Committee to go into the provinces to inquire into the comparative cost of manufacturing certain articles in the Royal dockyards and in private yards; but what they would not do was to apply to a practical man of business. They would not put the round post into the round hole, but constantly went on putting it into the square hole, and then they complained that it would not fit. In April last there appeared, in an organ which was supposed to represent hon. Gentlemen opposite, a very able article upon dockyard management, which, he hoped, forshadowed what hon. Gentlemen opposite would do if they came to that (the Ministerial) side of the House. As an earnest Liberal he trusted that the present Government, which professed to be a reforming Government, would not leave a great administrative reform to be executed by the Conservatives; but whether a proposal for dockyard reform came from one party or the other, he was sure that if it was in accordance with the principles of common sense it would receive the support of a large number of Members who sat near him.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to continue the practice of appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years,"—(*Mr. Seely,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: Sir, I am far from being displeased that the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) should have again taken the trouble to go into the various details connected with the expenditure in our dockyards, but the House will see that it is impossible for either myself or my hon. Colleague to follow him through them. Nevertheless, I sincerely hope that the figures will, as the hon. Gentleman hopes, appear in *The Times*, because we shall then have an opportunity of looking carefully into the statements, and I trust that the public will be benefited. Ever since the present Board of Admiralty came into power they have desired to give the fullest information with respect to the dockyards, and the hon. Gentleman has given the best evidence that we have done so by quoting our figures. No doubt, speaking generally, work done in the dockyards is more expensive than work done in private yards, but I believe in the long run it is the cheaper on account of its superior quality. Whether it is right that we should have Royal dockyards is a separate question. For my own part I think that it is of great importance that we should have such yards, and should not depend entirely upon the trade for either the building or repairing of our ships. I do not intend to follow the hon. Gentleman into his figures, but my belief is that he has taken rate-book prices which he has on several occasions been told are now in process of correction. Everybody knows that to establish correct rate-books of the cost of every article is a very difficult operation, but that is what we have endeavoured to do. Those rate-books are under constant revision, and while I do not believe that the discrepancies are anything like what the hon. Gentleman has stated, I am bound to admit that we have found considerable discrepancies between the prices of articles in different dockyards. I therefore readily acknowledge that it is desirable public attention should be called to these things, and that it is necessary that the rate-books should be carefully revised. I now come to the question which is more immediately before the House. The hon. Gentleman lays all these assumed shortcomings upon the naval Superintendents. The other night, in reply to the rather offensive strictures passed by the hon. Gentleman upon naval officers, an hon. Gentleman opposite asked how it happened, if naval officers were so incompetent to manage dockyards, the principal shipowners of this country were begging naval officers to take charge of their yards. It is the fact that the principal shipbuilding establishments of this country are dependent upon naval officers for their management. [MR. SEELEY: Name them.] I decline to name them. I have the names of the officers here, but I do not choose to place them before the public. If, however, the hon. Gentleman inquires he will find that four of the greatest shipbuilding companies in this country are now practically managed by naval officers. Is that, or is it not, an argument to show that naval officers are competent to discharge such duties? Then, take the case of foreign countries. The hon. Gentleman is no doubt an admirer of the Government of the United States; did he ever hear of a civilian in command of one of the dockyards belonging to the American Government? The thing does not exist. Or let him go to France. There is not a single Imperial dockyard that is not superintended by a naval officer. Indeed, all the principal countries in the world depend upon naval officers for the superintendence of their national dockyards. Why do they do so? Because they know practically that the work done, I do not say in purely building, but in great repairing and fitting yards, can best be done under the superintendence of naval officers. If we were to appoint a civilian to manage these yards, the country would show its dissatisfaction, because I am certain that the work would not be so well done, and that great additional cost would be incurred. The hon. Gentleman apparently knows nothing about a man-of-war. He has spoken his mind very emphatically about naval officers, and now I will speak my mind to him. I have no doubt that naval officers are quite unacquainted with his business, and I believe that he is utterly unacquainted with the business naval officers have to perform in our great dockyards. From the moment that the keel of a man-of-war is laid down, it is necessary that the practical sailor should give his opinion upon the various details connected with her building and equipment. How can a landsman, how can a civilian, know where to place the magazines with proper precautions against fire, and how to provide suitable facilities for handing up the powder, storing away all sorts of warlike stores, and placing the masts, anchors, chains and internal fitments? Those are all matters that are eminently naval in their character; and so great is the importance of the superintendence of naval men in regard to them, that when the Admiralty have ships built in private yards we are obliged to have practical naval officers continually going to look at them, in order that they may bring their experience to bear upon the construction of those ships. Such shipbuilding is totally distinct from the building of merchantmen. I am quite willing to admit that for the building of transports and merchant ships naval officers are not so competent, but I am satisfied that, if the Royal dockyards were placed in the hands of civilians, the system would break down. There is another circumstance connected with the dockyards which the hon. Gentleman appears to have overlooked when he talks of discharging persons who are not fully competent. If a private individual has in his dockyard a man who does not suit him he sends him about his business. I should like to know what would be said if, in our dockyards, we were to send people about their business because they did not exactly suit us. No public Department and no Government can, unless there are real and fair grounds, discharge their people as a private individul can. We are told that we mistrust civilians. Now, I ask the House to consider what took place last year. We heard of an eminent shipbuilder, a gentleman who had distinguished himself in drawing the lines of ships, a very scientific man. He was wholly unconnected with the Government service, but believing him to be a person who was thoroughly competent, we brought him from private trade into the service of the country. That gentleman was Mr. Reed. Hon. Members will recollect to what an outcry his appointment gave rise. I am very glad that we made that appointment, because Mr. Reed has performed his duties most satisfactorily. So far, therefore, I am speaking in the sense of the hon. Gentleman, but I can assure him that, if he thinks the superintendence of our dockyards could advantageously be handed over to private individuals, he is greatly mistaken. There are many difficulties to be encountered. To take a ship in or out of dock you must have a naval man. The hon. Member could not do it, or any of his civil Friends. And does anybody think that a naval officer of high standing would submit to be put under a civilian? Such a system would not work at all. Instead of getting the work done we should be at perpetual loggerheads on questions of priority among these dockyard officers. I hope the hon. Gentleman will be satisfied with what he has already done, in which so far he has performed good service. We have prepared elaborate Returns, and we have laid them on the table with a view to criticism, which is always useful. We shall all, I hope, meet on a future occasion in the same places to renew the discussion of the price of these articles. But the hon. Member, I hope, will not feel it his duty to press the matter further. On the question of anchors and cables, before sitting down, I will say that there can be no doubt that we pay higher for our anchors and cables than others do. But this is no new subject. I have said, and say again, that I look on anchors and cables as of the first importance to the existence of ships and the lives of their crews, and therefore that anything like mere buying in the cheapest market must be detrimental to the public service. That there are private companies and traders who make first-rate anchors and cables, from whom we might obtain them on more reasonable terms, I am perfectly aware. Two or three years ago we stated that we were willing to open our contracts to private enterprize, only stipulating that, as we dared not risk inferiority in the fittings of our large ships, the private makers should be invited, in the first instance, to make cables and anchors of smaller size. If they had been up to the mark we should then have opened the contracts for the larger size. The manufacturers replied that unless the whole business were thrown open to them it would not be worth their while to undertake it, and so we came at once to a point of divergence. I should certainly object to any untried firm making the anchors and cables for such ships as the *Warrior.* I am sorry that the hon. Member reiterated his censures with regard to the dockyard police. Even if they cost a great deal more than they do I never would consent to have them put down, for I could lay on the table Returns that would surprise hon. Members, of the sums of money saved since their introduction by the driving out of low marine store dealers. I hope sincerely the House will not agree to the Motion of the hon. Member. We have given the subject now before the House much consideration, and, after hearing it discussed many times, I must inform hon. Gentlemen that the Duke of Somerset and the Admiralty are wholly averse from the system of employing civil superintendents.

Mr. BRIGHT: Sir, I wish to make a few observations on this subject. I think the House will feel that the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) has given to it a most industrious examination, and has brought it before the House in a manner that was very clear, and that will prove, I hope, very useful in future. I further think the House will admit that the noble Lord (Lord Clarence Paget) has entirely failed to make an answer to the speech of my hon. Friend. For the most part he admitted nearly every charge brought against the Admiralty; he has not disputed one of the facts with regard to the extravagant cost of ships, or the still more extravagant cost of repairs. My hon. Friend has shown that a ship cost in one, two, and three years more for repairs than the ship would have cost when new, and the noble Lord did not object to that statement. [Lord Clarence Paget: I do object to it.] The noble Lord did not object to it in his speech. If he objects to it he has given no answer to it. My hon. Friend referred to the subject of the purchase of anchors and chains, and the noble Lord said the Admiralty think it highly necessary to have anchors and chains of the best quality. He did not answer the statement of my hon. Friend, that the makers of chains and anchors who are not employed by the Government are making them exactly like those that the Government buy from the firms favoured by their custom, and that those chains and anchors are tried by the officers of the Government exactly in the same manner and with the same stringent examination that is applied to the chains and anchors used by the Government, and that those chains and anchors are sold at cheaper rates by those firms to other Governments, who I presume are as anxious to have good chains and anchors for the safety of their ships and the lives of their seamen as the English Government can possibly be. The noble Lord did not explain why a particular firm for a long period had been making chains and anchors for the Admiralty at a price 50 per cent higher than the Admiralty could have bought chains and anchors of equal quality from other firms in the trade. That should have been answered. The noble Lord does not require to go to the pigeon-holes of the Admiralty to show how for a number of years a particular firm has been favoured with the Admiralty orders at a price 50 per cent higher than the chains and cables could be bought from other firms equally respectable and honourable in the trade. That is a matter to which the noble Lord should have turned his attention, but he did not do so. But I think that one part of the noble Lord's speech will have a very injurious effect on persons employed in the dockyards. He says, and we can understand what is meant by it, that the Admiralty have great difficulties to encounter, and that this Government and every Government have to experience such difficulties in the employment of a great number of officers. The noble Lord said, if a man be found entirely inefficient, what are we to do with him? Would it not be thought very unjust if a man who was not so efficient as he might be, should be discharged in the manner that private parties would discharge persons they found inefficient? If that doctrine enunciated by the noble Lord, and that statement of a difficulty for which he points out no remedy, go forth to persons in the employment of the Government, it appears to me that very injurious notions will be put into their heads, and that they will feel that though persons employed by the Government are inefficient, such is the state of things in the Department of the Admiralty that they cannot be got rid of.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: I never said so. I should be sorry to say any such thing. I did not say Government had no means of discharging inefficient persons. What I said was, that if in a private yard a person does not suit they can discharge him at once; but the Government have not the same facility for discharging persons that private firms have.

MR. BRIGHT: That is exactly what I stated the noble Lord said. I am not charging the noble Lord with neglecting his duty. It may be one of the difficulties of Government employment, and one that cannot be wholly removed or dealt with so easily as it could be disposed of by private firms. It certainly has not been the custom to get rid of such persons with equal promptitude. But that is a doctrine very pernicious to be stated in this House from the Treasury Bench and by the Secretary of the Admiralty. But I do not believe there are not men in the service of the Admiralty capable of undertaking the proper management of the dockyards. Surely he gave us a case in which a very valuable appointment had been made. The East India Company had 800 or 1,000 civilians in their employment, and yet the Government found it necessary to send over a gentleman from this country to look after the finances of India. It was an admission that out of a thousand civilian officers they had not one that appeared to understand the multiplication table or to be able to manage the finances of that great portion of our Empire. If it be true that there is no person in the employment of the Admiralty to do its work properly, it is the duty of the First Lord of the Admiralty and of the Board of Admiralty to take care that such a person should be found. Nothing is so monstrous as to say that while the shipbuilding establishments of private firms are as well managed as in other parts of the world the Government is not capable of finding competent men in their own Departments to do their work. If not, let them bring them from outside their Departments, so that the Government dockyards may be as well managed as private dockyards. What is wanted is, that the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Secretary to the Admiralty, and the managers and heads of the Department, should have, as their first object, to manage that Department well; and if there be men, or rules, or customs that interfere with its good management they ought to break down those rules and establish a better system in the Department which is under their control. But this always strikes me when this question is discussed, that the noble Lord and his Colleagues have in their hands placed every year by Parliament a sum I think exceeding £10,000,000, if it does not exceed £11,000,000. When I look at the trouble which it takes to manage a commercial or manufacturing undertaking which does not expend probably more than £100,000 or £200,000 a year, I can perfectly understand the enormous difficulty there must be in managing the dockyard establishments in various parts of the country and the world where the expenditure is more than £10,000,000 per annum. I believe, and my hon Friend the Member for Lincoln will excuse me for saying so, that it would be impossible, so long as Parliament grants readily and profusely whatever is asked—£10,000,000, or £11,000,000, or £12,000,000 per annum—that there should not be very considerable waste in the expenditure. Whenever this question has been discussed in this House, this year, last year, and ever since the Russian war—when our expenses were so great—there has been a universal admission on the part of every person not connected with the Admiralty that in that Department there is enormous and extravagant waste, which is not reputable to that Department, and is discreditable to Parliament and oppressive to the community. The noble Lord who is now Secretary to the Admiralty was a great reformer of that Department before he took office, and he hesitated very much when he was asked to take office. He doubted whether, having made speeches compared with which the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Lincoln is a mere whisper of discontent—speeches in which he overhauled everybody connected with the Admiralty who sat on that Bench, if he came into office he should be able to fulfil the promises which he had held out of performing the duties which he insisted on his predecessor performing. Well, the noble Lord has been in that office for, I think, about six years, and I have never seen any person in that office who has been so perpetually found fault with upon all sides of the House with regard to the management of this Department. I must say, at the same time, I have never heard anybody who was more confident, or more plausible in the answers he has been able to give to those who have contended with him. I was glad when the noble Lord took office, for I thought we were going to turn over a new leaf and have things done much better. I am sorry that being in office he has not been able to do that which I think he had hoped to do, and which, I think, the House had a fair reason to expect he would attempt to do. I make an excuse for him on this account. I believe the Admiralty is so constituted, the money expended by it is so enormous, the state of things is so chaotic, that, however great was his desire of effecting reforms when he took office, and notwithstanding his ability and industry, it would be impossible for him to remedy all the abuses. And if, besides being an Admiral of reputation, the noble Lord was an accountant in the city, industrious beyond all other men, I believe he could not do what he thought at the time he would be able to do, and which he now regrets he cannot do. I do not know whether my hon. Friend below me is going to divide the House on this question. If he does, I shall certainly with great pleasure divide with him; but I tender him my thanks for the careful, able, and admirable speech which he has made on this question.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 34; Noes 36: Majority 2.

Question proposed,

"That the words 'in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to continue the practice of appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years,' be added, instead thereof."

LORD CLARENCE PAGET: Sir, I put it to the House, whether it is fair for an hon. Member to come down to the House with an array of figures on matters of pure detail, and make a statement upon them, without giving us the opportunity of looking at them, or without any notice that he was going into such details. I appeal to the House whether it is fair to a public Department to take such a course. Sir, I feel it to be my duty to oppose his Motion.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, there were two points asserted in the Resolution. The one was the inexpediency of appointing naval officers who were not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business in Her Majesty's dockyards, and the other was a disapproval of the practice of limiting their tenure of office to five years. Now, many hon. Members might be disposed to agree with the one, but to dissent from the other. Having passed a portion of his life in connection with the dockyards, he thought it would be extremely inconvenient not to have naval officers at the head of those establishments, and he was convinced that the men themselves employed in the dockyards would feel more satisfaction if a naval officer were placed as Superintendent than they would if a mere layman occupied the position, however superior he might be in technical knowledge. The character, and influence, and authority of naval officers were necessary to keep the dockyards in order. He was never aware that the captains of the yards interfered minutely with the details of business; their duty was to superintend the general arrangements. As to the other point, in regard to limiting the tenure of office to five years, he thought that where a captain was superintending, and before the end of the term succeeded to his flag, there might be a modification of the rule so far as not to allow him to retire until the end of the term.

MR. NEATE said, he had always understood from reading works of fiction, particularly the novels of Captain Marryat, which were the principal source of his nautical knowledge, that a naval officer ought to be acquainted with all the details of his ship, and if the offices in the dockyards were open to them as a prize, they would have an interest in acquiring that knowledge. It was very undesirable, therefore, that the present system should be altered.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, it seemed to him that the Resolution before the House came to this, that officers who were not possessed of a technical knowledge of the work carried on in the dockyards should not be appointed. A great many naval officers, however, were possessed of that knowledge. There were various other things to be taken into consideration besides the building of ships.

The rigging of ships was an important matter, where the weights should be placed, where the piercings for the guns should be made, and other things of the same kind. He remembered a time when the ships could not sail close to the wind because the shrouds were placed too far forward. A naval officer was placed at the head of the dockyards; he put the shrouds further back, and the ships were enabled to sail closer to the wind. The same officer also made a great improvement in the sails, and thus a great saving was effected. Here, then, were two improvements introduced, not by a civilian, but by an officer who had served all his time at sea and had gained battles there. Allusion had been made to the French dockyards. They had in France a school of naval architecture similar to that which had been established by the Government, only the French school was on a much more extensive scale. The French Government educated their naval officers there, every officer having to pass two years at the school. There he learned many branches of science applicable to naval architecture, and the result was those officers became so eminent that they were sought by all the firms throughout France, they were sought by foreign countries, and they were placed at the head of the various steam-packet establishments. Considering all those facts he thought the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite was not one which ought to be agreed to, inasmuch as the Government had adopted the most proper course. They had established a naval school, by means of which, he firmly believed, most naval officers—if not all of them—would become eminent by their knowledge of shipbuilding.

Mr. BRIGHT: Sir, I am very much surprised at the course taken by the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty, because he seems to me as if he were anxious to shut out any admonition on the part of the House that should enable him and the heads of his Department to control that Department in a more satisfactory manner. What can be more reasonable and more gentle than the proposition made by my hon. Friend (Mr. Seely)? It is not that you shall not have as superintendents of dockyards naval officers, but that you shall not have them of necessity. Therefore all the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite go for nothing. It is that, when you appoint a naval officer, he shall be a man who has a technical knowledge of the duties he is expected to superintend. Was anything more rational ever proposed to Parliament? I shall not say was anything so rational ever refused by Parliament? That would be an absurd question to ask. But if the noble Lord (Lord Clarence Paget) should persuade the House to refuse this Resolution it will be tantamount to obtaining from Parliament an acknowledgment that it is right to appoint to the office of Superintendents of dockyards men who, being naval officers, know nothing of the duties which they are expected to discharge. I will undertake to say that if the proposition be now negatived it will be obtaining from Parliament a sanction to a gross abuse—namely, that you should place men in charge of the expenditure of something like £3,000,000 a year, and that there shall be no blame attached to the Department if these men so placed in charge know nothing of the matters they are expected to superintend. I ask the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it would not be much better not to divide the House, and to accept these words—not to accept them as a stringent rule which shall bind them down to do a certain thing, but that they shall understand that in the judgment of Parliament it is desirable that when officers are appointed Superintendents of dockyards they should know something about the business which they are expected to superintend. With regard to the question whether the Superintendents should continue in office for a longer period than five years, that, perhaps, is not a matter of quite such importance, but it does seem unfortunate that there should be a change in the men just at the time when they become competent in their departments. Aware of the views of reform entertained by the noble Lord in regard to the Admiralty, and of the anxiety which, I have no doubt, he sincerely entertains and feels, that that Department of the Admiralty should be conducted in a manner more in accordance with the interests of the public and the views of this House, I ask him to accept the words of my hon. Friend as a positive assistance to him in the right performance of his duties. I think if he rejects them that he will weaken his own power and that of his Colleagues, and will do that which for years past I have heard him assert in this House most strongly ought not to be done in the interests of the public.

Mr. W. O. STANLEY said, he was of the opinion that the resolution was a most proper one. What did the Admiralty themselves do with regard to the officers whom they had appointed to steam vessels? In the first instance they had obtained incompetent men to manage them, but now they would not appoint an officer to command unless he had attended at Portsmouth a regular course of steam instruction. On these grounds the noble Lord would be well advised to accept the Motion.

MR. CORRY said, the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) had thrown a new light upon the resolution of the hon. Member for Lincoln. So far as he (Mr. Corry) understood its meaning it went to say, not that naval officers, but that civilians possessed of a technical knowledge of shipbuilding ought to be appointed to the office of Superintendent. He was not present when the hon. Gentleman made his statement, but he was told that that was the sense in which he spoke. He (Mr. Corry) should like to know if the interpretation which was now put upon the Resolution by the hon. Member for Birmingham be correct, what right had the hon. Member for Lincoln to assume that naval officers placed at the head of the dockyards had not that competent knowledge of shipbuilding which he deemed so necessary? He spoke with some experience of the Admiralty when he asserted that the Board always endeavoured to select the best qualified officers that could be found to occupy the post of Superintendents of Her Majesty's dockyards. He should like to hear the name of a Superintendent who had been found to be incompetent. He maintained that, as a general rule, they had been well selected, and performed their duties satisfactorily. It was a mistaken opinion that it was necessary that the head of the dockyard should be a shipbuilder. They might as well say that artists should be canvas-makers, because they painted on canvas. If the object were merely to build ships it would be different, but after a ship was built there was much to be done to put her into a proper state for sea, and to fit her as a man-of-war, and it was not to be expected that an officer of the rank of Staff Commander, exercising the duties of a master attendant, in whose department this lay, would take his orders from a master shipwright. Although the plans, &c., were laid down in the office of the Surveyor of the Navy, Superintendents of dockyards frequently communicated valuable suggestions respecting the fittings and arrangements of a ship to the Surveyor, and they were in many instances acted upon. The presence of an experienced naval officer, as the head of a dockyard, was of the greatest advantage. So far from dockyard work costing more than contract work, as stated by the hon. Member for Birmingham, he (Mr. Corry) would undertake to prove to the satisfaction of a Select Committee that extravagant expenditure was occasioned by the latter more than by the former. It had been said that it was absurd that the cost of repairing a ship should be greater than the cost price, but he knew of no such instance in the case of ships built in our dockyards, though it had not been rare in the case of contract-built ships. If the dockyards cost a great deal the country had the worth of its money.

MR. DALGLISH said, that he did not think that this Motion had anything to do with the total exclusion of qualified officers of the navy from the superintendance of the dockyards. All they asked was that qualified Superintendents should be appointed, whether officers of the navy or not. There was a prevailing impression throughout the country that the dockyards were not managed with that consideration for economy which was desirable. It was, therefore, most important that Superintendents of dockyards should be men who knew something of accounts, and were qualified to attend to the management of large concerns. As sailors, the present naval Superintendents might be efficient, they might have distinguished themselves in fighting their ships, but, after spending many years of their lives at sea, they were not fit to manage large manufacturing establishments. He hoped, therefore, that the House would agree to accept the words proposed.

MR. CHILDERS said, the Resolution was not an abstract proposition as to these appointments, but a distinct assertion that it was inexpedient to continue an existing practice, and therefore implied a censure on the present mode of appointment of naval officers. His hon. Friend (Mr. Seely) had brought forward a mass of figures, and in doing so he made an extraordinary statement—namely, that his only wish was to see them to-morrow in the newspapers. How was it possible for his noble Friend (Lord Clarence Paget) or himself to refute figures some of which his hon. Friend would not even read, and which he handed over to the reporters to be put in print? What his hon. Friend did on a former occasion was to communicate with him beforehand, and to tell him what were the items he meant to discuss. This was a course which enabled him to meet his hon. Friend, but it was impossible to discuss figures some of which were not even read. However, since the division he had had time to look into one or two of the figures read by his hon. Friend, and he would tell the House what those figures actually were. The hon. Gentleman alluded to the cost of certain milled lead and lead pipes, the items referring to which he extracted from the balance-sheet of 1862-3; and he said that such was the extravagance of the Government system of manufacture, that the Government lost upon the year, he believed the hon. Gentleman said, £1,090. Now, the whole amount of the account of the year was, on the debtor side, £10,048 for materials, £185 for labour, £165 for general expenditure, and £1,015 as percentage to meet those general charges which his hon. Friend said were not brought in at all. The only expenditure, therefore, over which the dockyard authorities could have any control was £185 for labour and £165 for general expenditure, the total being £350. With the purchase of materials the dockyard authorities had nothing to do. The materials were placed at their disposal by the authorities of Somerset House; the price at which they were purchased was furnished to them, and they had to produce a manufacturing balance-sheet. How his hon. Friend could make a loss of £1,090 out of £350 did not appear. Perhaps he would say that he did not find fault with the dockyard authorities, but with the Storekeeper General. But this had nothing to do with his Motion, which referred to the present practice of dockyard appointments as an unsound one, and one which led to extravagance. An instance like this ought to warn the House to be a little careful in accepting general figures like those of his hon. Friend. For the purposes of debate it would have been much more convenient if his hon. Friend, instead of reading off certain figures so rapidly that it was difficult to follow them, had done him the kindness to place those figures in his hands, that he might look into them, and then he could probably have done justice to the department, and have put the House right as to the mode in which the accounts were prepared. As to the balance-sheet of the manufacturing departments, he thought he had wearied the House by his explanations. He would remind the House that he had already stated the changes which were in process of introduction, and which the hon. Gentleman himself had admitted were a great improvement. All the objections of the hon. Gentleman referred to a past state of things—namely, the accounts in 1862; the basis of which had been since revised by himself and his predecessor in office.

Mr. SEELY said, he had not his figures with him, and he could not refer to them, but if his hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) would do him the favour, as he did on a former occasion, of meeting him at Somerset House, he would go into the question with him, and he would venture to affirm that in less than half an hour his hon. Friend would admit that he was right. The difference in price between ingot lead and pipe lead in the market was 3*d.* per cwt., one being 20*s.* 3*d.* and the other 20*s.* 6*d.*; and in calculating this account he deducted from the total cost of the ingot lead, and then he said so much was for labour, and he put it to the House whether that was not a fair way of estimating the cost of the labour. The cost for labour in the Government manufactory was 1*s.* 8½*d.*, as against 3*d.* for the milled lead, and 4*s.* 8*d.* or 4*s.* 10*d.* for pipes, as against 3*d.*, the cost in the open market. When he met his hon. Friend, the junior Lord of the Admiralty, at Somerset House, he must admit that nearly every statement he (Mr. Seely) made in the House on a former occasion was found to be correct. As regarded balance-sheets it was absurd to say that such charges as interest on capital laid out were not to be taken into account in estimating the cost of an article.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that as the hon. Member had challenged him as to certain matters, it was necessary that he should explain. The hon. Member had on a former occasion quoted certain figures from a Report, which were in black and white, which it was impossible for him to contradict, and he never had. What he did contradict——

Mr. SPEAKER called the hon. Gentleman to order.

Mr. SEELY said, he repeated his challenge to meet the hon. Gentleman at Somerset House, and if he did not make good his statement about the lead he would apologise to the House. With regard to the balance-sheet referred to, it was necessary to take into account the charges for labour, gas, rent, and other matters of that kind, which should be charged in ascertaining the cost of an article. It was an absurdity to argue this question without that were done.

MR. CHILDERS said, he hoped he might be permitted to explain. He had been stopped in the middle of a sentence.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Gentleman might explain what required explanation in his own speech, but he must not reply.

MR. CHILDERS said, he must appeal to the House whether, having been challenged, and the cheers of the House requiring that he should answer it, he was to be stopped in the midddle of a sentence.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was not in order. If it were permitted, he might go on making half-a-dozen more speeches.

ADMIRAL WALCOTT, said, he believed that the Admiralty in selecting the Superintendents were not actuated by party feelings, but chose the officers most capable of presiding over the dockyards. If the Superintendents were acquainted with shipbuilding they would be more efficient, but that knowledge was not indispensable, as they had under them assistants who possessed experience in the construction of vessels. He admitted that the expense was considerably more in the Royal dockyards than in the private yards, but that was owing to the contracts, with the making of which the Superintendents had nothing to do. The present Motion might be of advantage in directing the attention of the Admiralty to many points which had been touched upon, but he thought that naval officers were the most suitable persons to preside over the Royal dockyards. The most important duty they had to perform was to examine ships when they came home from foreign stations, and put them in an efficient state to proceed to some other distant station—in fact, they were called upon to discharge duties which no Superintendent Shipwright would be able to perform. In case of war, or of a ship requiring to be immediately refitted on her coming home from a foreign station, it would be impossible to rely on the yards at Liverpool and Glasgow, and in the Thames. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Motion.

MR. FINLAY said, he admitted that with regard to economy the Royal dockyards could not be compared with private yards; but that was not exactly the question before the House. The question was, whether naval officers who were without a peculiar technical knowledge were suitable for Superintendents. It was impossible for any one person, whether naval or civilian, to have a technical knowlege of all the various branches of the business carried on in the dockyards; but he maintained that a naval man was better qualified than any other for the post of superintendent, because an important part of his duty was to take care that ships were sent to sea in a fit state to meet an enemy. The effect of the Resolution would be entirely to disqualify naval officers from holding these offices, and he therefore hoped that the House would not agree to it.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, it seems to me that the question is a very simple one, upon which the good sense of the House can hardly fail to come to a right conclusion. My hon. Friend (Mr. Seely) who made the Motion contends, and contends with some force—if all that is required is to construct a wooden frame that shall float and be a good ship to go through the water—that a civilian may be as fit, and possibly a more fit person, to superintend a dockyard than a naval officer. But the business of the Royal dockyards is to construct, not simply vessels to go through the water, but vessels adapted to the purposes of war; and I think that my noble and hon. Friends (Lord Clarence Paget and Mr. Childers) have shown conclusively that none but a naval officer, who knows what a ship of war ought to be and is conversant with all those details which adapt her to the purposes of war, can properly superintend the construction of vessels intended to serve those purposes; and, therefore, that if you were to exclude naval officers from the superintendence of the dockyards, you would be doing a great injury to the public service. The Resolution as it stands seems to me not only to affirm that which I think is erroneous in reason, but to pass a censure which is not deserved, because it says that the practice of appointing naval officers who are unfit for the offices to which they are appointed ought to cease. My hon. Friend ought to show that such a practice exists. We deny that it does. We say that the naval officers who have been appointed to the superintendence of dockyards, and those who are now filling such offices, have been and are perfectly competent to perform the duties which specially belong to an officer who has to produce a ship of war for the service of the nation. I should therefore hope that the House will be content to allow my hon. Friend who made the Motion (Mr. Seely), to meet my hon. Friend the Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Childers) at Somerset House, and fight their battles over pages of figures in the way in which the hon. Member for Lincoln proposed that the duel should be carried on. I have no doubt that the result of that single combat between the two champions would be that they would come to some conclusion with reference to the facts which would be satisfactory to both. I am quite sure that neither of them will endeavour to arrive at anything but the truth; and, under these circumstances, I trust that the House will not agree to a Motion which points to a conclusion which is not founded in reason and seems to cast an imputation upon officers who do not at all deserve it.

Mr. AYRTON said, that he on the contrary hoped that the House would accept the Resolution in the sense in which it was intended. The noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) had entirely misconceived its meaning. It declared that it was inexpedient to continue the practice of appointing naval officers who possessed no technical knowledge of the business of the dockyards. He was sure that the noble Lord would not assert that the naval officers who had been made Superintendents had been appointed in consequence of their technical knowledge. It was matter of notoriety that they were appointed because they were distinguished fighting officers. All that the Resolution affirmed was that if a naval officer was appointed he ought to be a man who possessed technical knowledge, and that if no officer so qualified could be found the Government ought to look elsewhere.

Mr. LAIRD said, that he entirely approved that part of the Resolution which condemned the practice of changing the Superintendents of dockyards every five years. He could not see any reason for such a course, except to increase the patronage of the Admiralty. As to the Superintendents themselves, in his opinion the best man to be at the head of a dockyard was not a gentleman who possessed merely a technical knowledge of one branch of the work which was performed there, but a good man of business and practical knowledge, who should exercise control over the heads of departments, and see that the various officers carried out the works intrusted to them.

Question put,

"That the words 'in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to continue the practice of appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years,' be added, instead thereof."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 33; Noes 60: Majority 27.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair what was the Question before the House? The original question had been that the Speaker do leave the Chair, to which an Amendment had been moved, and the House decided that all the words after the word "that" should be omitted. Now the House had decided that other words should not be added, and the consequence was that the word "that" was the only question before the House. He wished to know whether it was competent for an hon. Member to put a Question upon that word.

Viscount PALMERSTON: I beg to move that this House do on Monday resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) has justly pointed out what the course of the House has been. It has negatived the Motion that I now leave the Chair, and it has declined to add the words which were just now the subject of discussion; but I apprehend the hon. Gentleman who has now risen (Mr. Hanbury Tracy) is going to supply the deficiency by suggesting some words to be added to the word "that" which may perhaps be more acceptable to the House.

THE ORDER OF THE BATH.

ADDRESS MOVED.

Mr. HANBURY TRACY said, he rose to ask the noble Lord at the head of the Government the question of which he had given notice, and in doing so claimed the indulgence of the House, feeling that he was treading on somewhat delicate ground. The appointments to and promotions in the Order of the Bath which had recently been made had attracted the attention of officers of all grades in both branches of Her Majesty's service, and they found themselves unable to reconcile those appointments and promotions with the original design with which the order was instituted. The decoration of the Bath had, above all others, been looked upon as the reward of merit exclusively, but some of the late appointments had given rise to the suspicion that it was in danger of losing its distinctive character and of being lowered to the level of those foreign insignia which meant so little and were so easily acquired. He did not know whether it was in contemplation to make a fusion of the several distinctions which were comprised under the general name of the Order of the Bath, but it seemed that what had lately been done was a step in that direction. It was hardly necessary to remind the House that the Order of the Bath was revived by George I. in May, 1725, and was further enlarged by the Prince Regent in 1815, he being desirous of commemorating the auspicious termination of the long and arduous contest which the country had been engaged in, and of marking in an especial manner the valour and devotion shown by officers engaged by sea and land. It was then directed that the Order should in future consist of and be divided into three classess—the Grand Cross, Knighthood, and the Companionship of the Bath. The regulations connected with it were expressly laid down by statute, and it was ordained that no person should be admitted to the third class

> "Unless his services should have been marked by especial mention in despatches, as having distinguished himself by his valour and conduct in action against the enemy whilst in command of a ship of war, of troops, or while at the head of a military department, or as having by some actual service under his immediate conduct and direction contributed to the success of such action."

No one could for a moment dispute the fact that it was the intention of the Prince Regent when he expressly laid down the rules which were to form a guide for the entrance into the lower grades that the same should apply to the higher, and that, therefore, no officer should have the Grand Cross or Knighthood of the Order conferred on him unless he were qualified to become a Companion of the Order. But, as if to show this more distinctly, in the year 1847 Her Most Gracious Majesty was pleased to still further enlarge the Order by the construction of a Civil branch, comprising three grades as in the military. This branch had enabled Her Majesty to confer the decoration on those who by long meritorious service and devotion to the Sovereign in a civil capacity were entitled to some such mark of distinction. But the very creation of this division unmistakably pointed out that it was the wish of the Sovereign that military and civil services should receive distinct rewards, and that the prestige and dignity of the military decoration should be kept alive intact. Such, at any rate, had been the principle and character of the Order as viewed by officers both of the army and navy. The value of a decoration consisted entirely in the rigid observance of the regulations under which it was first instituted. In a service where there were few such decorations, in a country disliking ribands and insignia, that which distinctively pointed out a man as having distinguished himself in action as well as having served his country for a long number of years was naturally regarded as the only Order of merit, and was prized accordingly. Among the appointments which had lately been made there were cases which had created the impression that the old constitution of the Order had been altered or was about to be changed. They found officers who had never distinguished themselves in action, officers who by the rules expressly laid down in 1815 were not qualified even to become Companions, receiving the Grand Cross and Knighthood of the Order, and, what was even still stranger, it was found that officers had been transferred from the civil to the military branch. If it was urged that whether the country was at peace or at war it was necessary that the number in the higher grades should be kept complete, and that therefore during peace officers must receive the decoration without any very distinguished service, it was a sufficient answer that there were very many officers now Companions of the Order who were well qualified to enter on the higher grades, and that as England always had some little war in hand there never would be a lack of distinguished officers. When he looked among the list of Companions he found officers whose services none could dispute, and whose deeds of gallantry before the enemy had appeared in despatch after despatch, but who were passed over, while others with no military claims whatever under the existing statute received the highest honours. He thought that no more remarkable instance could be shown than in the case of an officer well known to that House for his deeds of daring. He alluded to "Nemesis" Hall, now an admiral, but who ever since he received the Companionship of the Order had been placed entirely in the background. Was it to be wondered at that under these circumstances great dissatisfaction should prevail both in the army and navy, and that officers who for heroic conduct and bravery in action received the Companionship, thinking at the time it was but a stepping-stone to the next, should look with dismay at these decorations, and were anxious to know whether the C.B. was in future to be the only military decoration, and what were the regulations to be enforced? He hoped that in what he had said he would not be thought to dispute the Royal Prerogative to confer this Order on whom it pleased. He had raised this question with the view of guarding that gift most jealously from being lowered in value. His only object was to set at rest a feeling of uneasiness which had pervaded both services during the last few months, and in justice to those gallant officers who had received the Military Order in former years for actual service. He felt confident that the statutes of the Bath were either entirely misunderstood by the army and navy, or that the regulations had undergone some silent alteration. He begged to ask the noble Lord whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to recommend to the Crown the amalgamation of the Civil and Military Orders of the Bath; and to move an Address for returns of any alterations and the regulations.

Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of any Regulations altering the Constitution of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath."—(*Mr. Hanbury Tracy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir WILLIAM FRASER said, that when he had called attention to the subject of the Order of the Bath upon a former occasion, the noble Lord had conferred a boon upon the gallant officers admitted to the Order by remitting the fees of which formerly they had been mulcted. On this occasion he did not intend to animadvert upon any recent appointments, believing that it was the Royal Prerogative to confer the distinction as it pleased. The Order had always held a distinguished place in the annals of the kingdom. Originally, no doubt, it was a personal mark of honour from the Sovereign. Henry IV. at his Coronation gave a large number of such distinctions, and Charles II. at the Restoration gave away a large number of Red Ribands, and thereby lowered the value of the distinction. In the reign of George I., Walpole met many claims for the Order of the Garter by creating thirty-six Knights of the Bath, and mulcting them of £1,000 each. He took the Order himself, and met the remonstrances of the Duchess of Marlborough, as to her grandson not receiving the Garter, by the reply, "Madam, who takes the Bath now may take the Garter hereafter." The title of Sir Robert Walpole was derived from the Bath; and in later times some of our best known characters, such as Sir Philip Francis and Sir Joseph Banks, were indebted for their titles to this Order of which they had been made Knights. To the end of the Peninsular War the members styled themselves simply Knights of the Bath; but a time arrived when it became necessary to imitate the foreign Orders of Knighthood, and the Prince Regent was advised to divide the Order into three Classes—Grand Crosses, composed principally of soldiers, but with some civilians, and two other Classes, composed entirely of soldiers. It still, however, retained its character of being in the main a military Order; and the Duke of Wellington, who usually held these honours very cheap, was so attached to this particular distinction that after the battle of Vittoria, when it was intimated that the Prince Regent intended to confer on him the Order of the Garter, application was made by him to Lord Bathurst that the usual practice of giving up the Red Riband on receiving the Blue might be departed from in this particular instance. The answer was that it could not be permitted; but the year following the Order was remodelled, the original K.B.'s being made into G.C.B.'s, and the Duke of Wellington, of course, was one of the first to receive the new dignity. It was a curious fact that the Duke of Wellington received the identical Red Riband which Lord Nelson vacated by his death. At the close of the Peninsular War a large number of Ribands were given; but afterwards matters remained for many years without change. There was another Order, not, strictly speaking, English, but Hanoverian, which was lately in the gift of the Crown, and was conferred for some time with judgment and discrimination, until the reign of William IV. who was so goodnatured a Monarch that whether the request preferred was for a Riband or a

Reform Bill he found the greatest difficulty in saying "No." The result was that the Guelphic Order became inundated with Knights; and the anecdote was told, that the King having complained one day at dinner of the pertinacity with which a country Mayor pursued him with Addresses, one of the King's relations sitting by said, "I should 'Guelph' him, Sir, at once!" On the separation of Hanover from England the Guelphic Order ceased to be given in England, and it was now an Hanoverian Order, bearing a high character. Twelve years ago the second and third Classes of the Bath began to be given to civilians; previously to this the First Class only had been conferred on Cabinet Ministers and Ambassadors, and others whose position and services might fairly be viewed as equalling those of men who had won the Order on the field of battle. This extension of the Second and Third classes to civilions rankled in the breasts of Military men, and it would, in his opinion, have been more prudent to avoid interference with a Military Order, and to have established an Order of Civil Merit. It might be said that Members of Parliament might wish for the Order; but he could not see why it should be harder to draw the line in Civil than in Military life, as to those rendering conspicuous service to the State. In old days there were sinecure appointments, which, no doubt, were abused at one time, but which, nevertheless, were very useful. An officer who had served with distinction abroad came home and was made governor of some undiscoverable fort, with a salary of some £300 or £400 a year. His country recognized his services and he was happy. But now that the wisdom of the present generation had swept away all those sinecures no means existed of rewarding long and meritorious conduct, save by continuing men in Office until they had long become incapable of serving the State—a practice which nobody could defend. He could not help thinking that an Order connected with our Protectorate of the Ionian Islands, but which did not pass away when we surrendered those territories to the King of Greece, might be now made use of with great advantage. The Order had always been one of distinction, conferred principally on Governors of the Island of Malta, Lord High Commissioners of the Ionian Islands, and other important bearers of Office; the officers of the Order performed functions which were altogether honorary, and no fees were demanded of the Knights. In these days it might be said that to institute an Order was an anachronism, but except the Garter, Golden Fleece, and the principal Order of Denmark, there were none of great antiquity really extant. The Order of the Star of India, created by Her Majesty only a few years ago, he had seen quite lately sparkling on the breast of Sir Hugh Rose, one of the most distinguished generals whom this country had ever produced, and he believed it was held in the highest estimation throughout Her Majesty's Eastern dominions.

Colonel SYKES said, the Order of the Bath was so strictly a Military Order that according to its statutes no officer ever could receive it whose name had not appeared in the *Gazette* for actual service in the field. Generally speaking it had been accorded to very proper claimants, but one case came to his knowledge where the officer who obtained it was three miles from the spot where powder was being burnt in anger. The name of Admiral Hall had been mentioned, and he felt it right to state with regard to that officer, that while Chairman of the Court of Directors of the East India Company he had felt it right on public grounds alone, without the least personal acquaintance with him, to offer him command in the Indian Navy. The services in India of Captain Hall failed to obtain for him the Order of the Bath, but he afterwards made a new claim for himself by services in the Baltic, which obtained for him the reward that his antecedents ought to have secured. He hoped the public mention of his name on that occasion would give him that further rank to which he was entitled by his services. It was, he thought, very much to be lamented that the real object of according these distinctions was sometimes lost sight of, and that family influence succeeded in obtaining what meritorious service simply had failed to attract.

Mr. SCOURFIELD said, he felt convinced that his hon. Friend who had brought forward this Motion (Mr. Hanbury Tracy) would be the last to desire to interfere with the Prerogative of Her Majesty, and that he only wished that some remedy might be devised which would put a stop to the dissatisfaction which existed with regard to the distribution of these Orders—a dissatisfaction about the existence of which there could not possibly be any doubt. The improvement desired was not dictated merely for sentiment, but would be found advisable in a pounds, shillings, and pence point of view, because gentleman could not be said to enter tbe Army as a rule merely for the emoluments which the service afforded them. He should regret if anything were done to diminish the value attached to those honours. He knew officers of the Army and Navy who, when they lost their good service pensions by a rise in rank desired that the records should be preserved, so that it might be known that they had received those pensions. It was highly desirable that the feeling of the Army and Navy should go along with the grant of these distinctions.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, I quite agree with what has fallen from my hon. Friend who spoke last, that it is most desirable, especially in the distribution of honours, that the general feeling of the army and navy should go along with the grace of the Crown. At the same time it is in human nature that many people should not be disposed to agree precisely in the particular selection that may be made, and it often happens that a person who is perfectly fit for the honour he may have received, may by others be compared with friends of their own, and there may not be universal acquiescence as to the relative merits of the individuals. I can, however, assure my hon. Friend that those who advise the Crown in the distribution of honours both to the army and navy are most anxious to do full justice to those services according to the ordinances and regulations of the Order, and that those should be selected who are the best entitled to the distinction. I cannot agree with my hon. Friend (Mr. Hanbury Tracy) who made this Motion that it is desirable to consolidate the civil and military Orders of the Bath. They are entirely separate. They are given for distinction in careers altogether different. I think it would diminish greatly the importance which the army and navy attach to the distinction of the military Order of the Bath if civilians wore precisely the same decorations, and were in no way to be distinguished from the others. I think it of great importance to separate the two Orders. No jealousy whatever is felt by the army and navy with regard to conferring the civil Order on those who by civil services have served Her Majesty. Although no doubt the services performed by the army and navy are far more brilliant than those of any civilians, yet there is great merit in the Civil Service, and there are many men who have distinguished themselves in different positions in the Civil Service, and upon whom it is very fitting this honorary distinction should be conferred in acknowledgment of the services they have rendered their country. I am not aware that any change has been made lately in the statutes of the Order of the Bath, and I trust, therefore, that my hon. Friend will not press his Motion for a return the particulars of which he has not stated. Some years ago there was an augmentation of the class of the Civil Service, and I think also of the Military. There is a circumstance to be borne in mind with regard to the military and naval branch of the Order. The regulations of the Service require that the person shall have been mentioned in the *Gazette*, and performed certain duties in the field before the enemy to entitle him to the decoration of the Order. Of course, in proportion as peace continues the candidates who have fulfilled this condition must progressively diminish, and it becomes matter for consideration whether, in view of the long continuance of peace, service of great merit, although not rendered in the field, may not be considered as coming within the fair spirit of the regulation by which the Order is conferred. My hon. Friend thinks that there is some partiality in the distributions. Of course, as I have said, persons may attach more value to the services of those they know, but I am perfectly satisfied that there has been no intentional departure from the most perfect justice in the distribution of the honours of the Order. With regard to the Mediterranean order of St. Michael and St. George, the hon. Baronet (Sir William Fraser) proposes that it should be enlarged and made applicable to services performed generally. That is a rather taking proposal at first sight, but it seems to me that the Civil Order of the Bath is sufficient for the purpose of awarding civil merit, and there is a great objection and inconvenience in multiplying unnecessarily these orders and decorations. There arises a great embarrassment in selecting persons peculiarly fitted for these distinctions, and as you multiply the means of rewarding services, in that proportion you multiply the claims that are made and the embarrassment of those who have to deal with them. In foreign countries these orders abound greatly, and in proportion as they abound their value is diminished. And so it would be here, nor do I think it is in accordance with the character of the country that we should see a great number of persons walking about the streets with decorations, in regard to which they could not, perhaps, very easily furnish the grounds upon which they were conferred. That would give rise to criticisms such as the hon. Gentleman has bestowed on the distribution of the Order of the Bath, and I think it would be better that the Order of St. Michael and St. George should be confined to those who have done service in the Mediterranean, and should not be made a general Order, like the Guelph for instance. We all recollect that the Order of the Guelph was so lavishly bestowed that its value was greatly diminished, and the anecdote is, I believe, perfectly true that was related by the hon. Gentleman, and that it was said to the monarch of some one—"It would serve him right to Guelph him."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

FORMS OF THE HOUSE.

QUESTION.

Mr. W. O. STANLEY, who had given notice to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty—

> "If there was any special Report made to the Lords of the Admiralty, by the Admiral of the station, as to the loss of ninety-two Sailors and Marines from the burning of Her Majesty's Ship *Bombay*, off Monte Video, on the 14th of last December:
>
> "If he can state the number of Marines and Sailors who were drowned, separately, and the length of time that elapsed from the first breaking out of the fire to the sinking of the ship:
>
> "If there were any patent Life-Belts on board; and, if so, if they were used:
>
> "If there is any order, rule, or system in the Navy, or the Marine Corps, under which the recruits or men are taught to swim; and if the boys in the service are instructed in the art of swimming:
>
> "And, how many the crew of Her Majesty's Ship *Bombay* were on the 14th of December?"

said, he was, he believed, precluded by the rules of the House from putting the Questions then, but would do so if the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty would allow him on another occasion.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH thought that his hon. Friend would be in order, because this was a new Motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been stated to the House that there is at present no Motion before the House. The only member of the sentence that remains is the word "That," and I think it necessary, in order to the due forms of the House, that if any hon. Gentleman wishes to address it he should conclude with a Motion. It will also be necessary that notice of such Motion shall have been given. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) has given notice of his intention to move for copies of correspondence, and he is therefore is order in addressing the House.

Mr. DILLWYN rose to address the House on the subject of his Motion—

Sir EDWARD DERING rose to order. He was sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but as he stood before him on the paper, and had given notice of his intention to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to explain the grounds of his statement relative to the dockyard at Sheerness, he would place himself in order by moving after the word "That" to add "it is desirable that the Secretary to the Admiralty should explain the grounds of his statement, &c."

Mr. SPEAKER said, he had pointed out to the House that the state of the Question did not permit any hon. Gentleman to make a speech unless he was prepared to conclude with a Motion. Another rule of the House was that a Motion could not be made without notice; and in conformity with that rule the hon. Member for Beaumaris (Mr. W. O. Stanley) had stated that he would take another opportunity of addressing his Question to the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty. Under these circumstances the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), who had given notice of his Motion, was rightly in possession of the House.

Mr. DILLWYN again rose to speak —

Mr. O'REILLY rose to order. He understood the word "That" was the only word which remained of the Motion before the House; to this the last Motion was an addition, and the whole of that Motion being withdrawn, a new Motion might be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion has been withdrawn, and the word "That" remains.

THE SOULAGE COLLECTION.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he had to call the attention of the House to the purchase of the Soulage Collection for the South Kensington Museum, and to move for Copies of Correspondence and Papers relating to it. He believed he should find favour in the eyes of the Chancellor of the Exchequer by the Motion, as upon a recent occasion he had severely reprobated the suggestion of paying for public works by deferred payments, designating such a course as a contrivance for concealing from the public the real amount of Public Expenditure. The facts were, that a collection, commonly known as the Soulage Collection, of majolica ware and Palissy ware, and other things of that sort, many very ugly, were acquired and brought into this country by some guarantee society of which Mr. Cole, of South Kensington, was an influential member. It was to be shown at the Art Exhibition at Manchester. When that exhibition was over it was offered to the city of Manchester, but declined, and it was subsequently purchased for South Kensington at about £14,000. The payment was deferred, and 5 per cent interest was to be paid on the unpaid portion. The sum, however, never appeared in the Estimates; in fact, South Kensington appeared generally to have acquired its property by deception, and in this case the transaction had certainly been kept from the knowledge of the House. There could be no doubt the purchase had been made; interest was also charged, and the whole amount of the purchase-money was only paid during the spring of the present year, the original purchase having been made in 1858. He desired to put a stop to any department acquiring property in this way, without the knowledge or authority of Parliament, and he also wished to know whether there were any other transactions of a like nature? A short time ago they had voted a sum of £10,000, which had been expended in a manner of which they knew nothing, and he wished to learn whether that sum had been appropriated towards the payment for that collection. South Kensington had also been flying in the face of a Resolution of that House. Last year there was a Select Committee on Schools of Art, and it was especially recommended that sums paid for certain objects should be kept distinct; but in the Report given this year there was no account whatever of the money which had been expended. At an earlier period of the Session he should have asked the House to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the whole of this transaction, which he thought a very discreditable one. He hoped the Treasury knew nothing of these proceedings, and that those connected with the Science and Art Department would take care that no such acquisition should be again made without the knowledge and consent of Parliament. He should also like to know whether the item of "£500 for the hire of specimens" had not been intended for the hire and use of this collection; and, if so, why it did not appear in former years.

Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "there be laid before this House, Copies of Correspondence relating to the purchase of the Soulage Collection for the South Kensington Museum."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. WARNER said, he wished to remind the House of the exhibition which had taken place of the Soulage collection at Marlborough House in 1857, when there was an affectation of consulting Parliament, and tickets were sent to hon. Members with a view to encourage its purchase by the nation. It was, indeed, a most wretched display. The greater part of the collection consisted of old locks, in which there was neither art nor mechanical skill. He had never heard till to-night that it had been purchased, and he hoped the information sought would be granted.

Lord ELCHO said, he wished to say a few words with respect to this Motion. He held in his hand a copy of a Correspondence for which he had moved in 1858 respecting this collection, which had been described as the greatest rubbish in the world. Certainly in matters of taste there would always be disputes; but if the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) referred to that Correspondence he would find that seventy gentlemen interested in art and manufactures — manufacturers, artworkmen, and others—subscribed £24,000 in order to purchase this collection as a nucleus for South Kensington before the Government interfered in the matter. At the head of that subscription were the names of some of the first men in the country, such as Lord Granville, the late Lord Ashburton, Mr. Napier, of Glasgow, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Sheepshanks, and, in short, the names of all the manufacturers in Great Britain who had acquired a reputation between 1851 and 1862. The Government afterwards purchased it of them, and deserved well of the country for so doing. It was the opinion of foreigners that the manufacturers of this country had made a great stride between 1851 and 1862, as the Exhibition of that year showed, and, if so, it was owing to this collection. Therefore, the Government and the managers of the Museum deserved praise instead of censure for what they had done, and for enabling our manufacturers to rival those of France. He did not stand up to defend the Kensington Museum. He thought it had exhibited a somewhat monopolizing tendency, but perhaps success had produced that effect. However, let the House give justice where justice was due, and they must all admit the great success of the Museum with respect to early Italian art. Our collection in that respect was one of which Englishmen might be justly proud, and which they might show to foreigners without grudging and without shame.

Mr. BLACKBURN said, it appeared, after all, that it was Government money which the gentlemen of whom the noble Lord had spoken had expended on the collection, and not their own. How was it that the gentlemen who purchased the collection did not present it to the Museum?

Lord ELCHO said, they purchased it to prevent its being dispersed, and then offered it to the Government at cost price.

Mr. BLACKBURN said, he thought the matter ought to have been brought before Parliament in the first instance. The collection was a paltry one. The Government seemed to have adopted a system of spending the public money for those things which did not lead to any practical use. They were all agreed that the expenses of the collection at Kensington were increasing every year, and nobody could enter the Museum there without seeing the absurd waste of money there was upon bits of pavement of antiquated pattern and little broken stones. Those who represented people who paid for such collections without seeing them had a right to complain.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, he did not understand what was meant when hon. Members charged his Department with spending money without the authority of the House. The House had year after year voted sums to be expended in making a collection of objects of art in the Museum, and an account was annually rendered of the manner in which the sums granted have been expended. With respect to the Soulage collection, he should say a few words in explanation, which the House, perhaps, would accept all the more readily because the Government of which he was a Member were not responsible for the purchase. He found no fault with the parties who were responsible, but the credit or discredit of the transactions was due to the Government of Lord Derby. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) had very correctly stated how that collection was offered for sale, and how a number of gentlemen who saw it were anxious to secure it for this country. Accordingly they bought it out of their own funds, and offered it to the Department for £14,000. Application was made to the Treasury to buy it for that sum, but the Treasury refused. Lord Salisbury, who then presided over the Department, endeavoured to discover some means by which the collection could be secured to this country. The House of Commons had for some years previously voted sums for the purchase of objects of art; and the objection of the Treasury applied not to value or importance or fitness of the collection for the purposes of the Museum, but only to the immediate outlay of so large a sum. A rule, however, had been laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) when he was at the Board of Trade, which had then the direction of such matters, that art objects might be taken on hire for the purpose of testing their genuineness. By a somewhat elastic application of that rule this collection was hired, and every year from that time a portion of the money voted by Parliament had been applied to the purchase of some part of the collection. The practice, however, originated in a Minute of Lord Salisbury's, and after the lapse of seven years it was hardly worth while to give it up. The Statute of Limitations ought to be applied to such transactions. The country by this time had acquired a very valuable collection. With respect to the charge brought against the Department of concealing what they had done, he might say in explanation that he undertook last year, when bringing forward the Estimates, that for the future they should be given in greater detail. The Estimates of the present year accordingly gave much fuller details than formerly. The account was divided into different heads, showing the cost of hiring as distinguished from the purchase of works of art; and distinguishing the estimates on account of the Schools from those of the Museum. The hon. Member for Carlisle (Mr. Potter) complained that the table of expenditure, usually inserted in the annual Report of the Department was not to be found in that for the present year. For that omission the hon. Gentleman was himself responsible, the publication of the Report having been made earlier by two months than usual at his urgent request, and having been issued at Easter instead of July, the materials for making a correct account of expenditure were wanting.

Mr. LOCKE said, he had been reminded by some remarks which had fallen in the course of the debate, of a lady's maid, who, having gone to the British Museum to enjoy herself for the day, was asked upon her return what she had seen, and she replied that she had seen a number of marble statues which appeared to her to be a representation of a railway accident. He did not mean to say that hon. Gentlemen looked at things in the same light. But it was difficult to know how people would regard certain things. What might appear only mutilated bodies and trumpery to one, to another might be works of art. He remembered several years ago his hon. Friend the Member for Stirlingshire (Mr. Blackburn) and himself sat upon a Committee before which Mr. Cole was examined, and the great object of his hon. Friend seemed to be to learn from Mr. Cole whether the Kensington Museum had been the means of bringing out anything new. The great struggle of Mr. Cole was to show that it had, but, when pressed, he was obliged to admit that they had only produced "a combination." Since then many new things had been done. The working classes, studying probably some of what hon. Members had called wretched old rubbish, had, in many instances, struck out something beautiful for themselves. Whatever it might have done some years back, it was quite evident that original designs were now being introduced through the influence of the collection at Kensington; and, therefore, he thought that those seventy gentlemen who had combined together to purchase this collection had done the State some service, and that they were subsequently quite justified in getting the Government to make the purchase instead of themselves.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, that to all intents and purposes the Government had purchased the collection, and the matter which the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) had brought forward well deserved the attention of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had asked whether it was fair to rake up that *faux pas* of Lord Derby's Government; but the consequences of that *faux pas* had only just been paid by the country.

Mr. EDWARD POTTER said, that a number of gentlemen had purchased this collection in 1856. The Government of that day refused to have it, and as there was to be an exhibition of art treasures at Manchester in 1857 the executive Committee, of whom he was one, applied for the loan of the Soulage collection, but the owners of it declined to lend it. They then wished the city of Manchester to buy it for a public museum. Mr. Cole, however, offered to purchase it, and it ultimately went to South Kensington. He believed that the purchase was a good one, and he had no wish to say anything whatever upon that subject. But he was very anxious for a statement of this account. He could not understand why a simple statement of the account could not be put at the end of it. [Mr. H. A. Bruce said the account was not yet made out.] He thought that the House was entitled to the statement asked for.

Mr. H. A. BRUCE said, he had omitted to notice one portion of the speech of the hon. Member (Mr. Dillwyn)—namely, that respecting the production of certain papers. He certainly objected to the production of the Correspondence between the Departments, but he would not object to produce the Correspondence between the owners of the collection at Manchester and the department in question.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

THE BALLOT.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. H. BERKELEY: Sir, I rise to move an Amendment—

> "That, as a General Election is impending, and we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters nor prevent Bribery, it is, therefore, expedient that a trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot."

At this period of the evening (eleven o'clock) it is impossible I can hope to have that support from hon. Members which I might have had if circumstances had allowed me to have brought this question on at an earlier period. At all times it is an irksome task to bring on what is called an annual Motion, but cases will occasionally arise in which duty must take the place of pleasure. I consider the ballot to be one of those questions which, when considered, will bring the mind to but one conclusion. We say it is impossible to defend the position that it is proper for the Legislature to confer the right of voting upon a body of men and to refuse them adequate protection for the exercise of that right. These are the grounds upon which we stand. I believe the ballot to be preferred by the public before any other reform. In 1852, in an able speech made by Mr. Cobden, that eminent man said that there was no new argument for the ballot since the admirable speech of Mr. Grote, and he added—

> "I look upon the ballot as the primary step of all reform. Of all the points of what is called the People's Charter there is nothing so odious to the aristocracy, to the landocracy, and the monied oligarchy that governs elections as the question of the vote by ballot."

Mr. Cobden likewise gave it as his opinion in one of his speeches that if any hon. Member would take the trouble to lay before the House the malversations of the franchise as carried on in several constituencies it would form a book of evidence, or an appendix to the body of evidence taken before the Election Committee, which would render the demand for the ballot one that could scarcely be refused. Now my speeches can only be looked upon as practical illustrations of the theories of Mr. Grote. It has been my custom to garrison the fortress raised by Mr. Grote, and to destroy those ghosts of arguments which have been killed over and over again, but which, nevertheless, crop up on all occasions, and never so much so as on the approach of a general election. Now, that is the course which I shall pursue on this occasion. I shall first take the instance of a young gentleman who has assailed some of Mr. Grote's theories. I will take that of a young gentleman who is now asking the suffrages of the ancient city of Chester. This young gentleman bears an honoured name, for which I, in common with the vast body of my fellow-countrymen, feel the greatest respect. It becomes me the more to take into consideration the arguments used by this young gentleman, inasmuch as I believe him to be wrong, and as I think I have it in my power to set him right. Mr. Gladstone, jun., ensconces himself under the gabardine of the Rev. Sydney Smith and Mr. John Stuart Mill. The ballot, said Mr. Gladstone, junior, in an off-hand way, received a quietus from the pen of Sydney Smith, and again from the pen of John Stuart Mill. As to the authority of Sydney Smith, that reverend gentleman wrote a sparkling pamphlet, though a superficial one, abounding in witticisms without logic, and in numerous jokes without argument. As to Sydney Smith giving the quietus to the ballot, it is somewhat ridiculous to imagine that he should be able so easily to dispose of the arguments of Jeremy Bentham, of Mill the elder, of Fonblanque, and of Grote. So far from Sydney Smith thinking he had given the quietus to the ballot, looking into his life I find a letter addressed by him to the late Lady Grey, in which he says—

> "I have written a pamphlet against the ballot very clever, of course, but the ballot will come write I never so wisely."

So much for Sydney Smith's notion of the quietus given to the ballot. Next, let me turn to John Stuart Mill, a gentleman of great ability, who has written many clever things, but I take his views to be of a purely theoretical kind, because I do not think he has had much experience, living as he did, until he was superannuated, at the India House. But Mr. Mill is the *cheval de bataille*, not only of Mr. Gladstone, junior, but of *The Times* newspaper. Mr. Mill said—

> "If I thought the electors of this country were so hopelessly and selfishly dependent on the landlords I should be, as I once was, a supporter of the ballot."

This, I must think, is a slovenly and slipshod way of getting rid of a former opinion. Why did he stop short at the intimidation of the landlord? Why did he not touch on other classes of intimidation, on intimidation by creditors, and by the inquisition of attorneys prying into all their affairs and holding men down with the screw, which was applied in the most Satanic manner? If the upper classes had become politically virtuous, and the under classes politically independent, I would not ask for a protection which I thought the electoral classes did not want; but I can show that the electoral constituencies, taken from 1835 to 1865, are in precisely the same condition, and that if there be any change it is for the worse. We have all read the evidence taken before Mr. Grote's Committee in 1835. That evidence was extensive, and brought the conclusion to the mind of every man who read it that the state of electoral affairs was getting worse. I will show shortly that, up to the present moment, the state of the franchise is what it was in 1837. I will state it first in the words of Lord Palmerston, who, at the nomination at Tiverton, on Tuesday, July 25, 1837, said—

> "My belief is founded not merely on what I have heard from others, but upon my own observations. I believe a system has been extensively pursued, to deter electors, by threats of injury to themselves, from electing the persons whom they think most fit to represent them."

No man will turn away from words uttered by my noble Friend; they always carry weight with me, whether uttered for me or against me, and here we have evidence from which we cannot turn away. Sir Henry Ward showed the franchise to be in a most deplorable state in 1847. In 1848 I had, for the first time, the honour, not of my own seeking, to lead the question in the House of Commons, and I stated a number of instances in that speech, after which I was successful enough to carry the Motion; but that was an accident, and did not truly represent the opinion of the House. I know the feeling of this House is against the ballot, and I do not speak to this House, but to the people out of doors. From 1848 to 1852 nothing could be more decisive than the evidence given before the Committee. Not only were the old impenitent boroughs committing their usual sins, but the modern boroughs were just as bad, or worse than the old boroughs. I do not know whether there was a pin to choose between Wakefield and Gloucester. At that time Lord Aberdeen admitted that our electoral system was in such a deplorable state of profligacy that everybody must be ashamed of it. A Committee was formed of almost all the lawyers in the House, and they produced a very bad Bill. The Attorney General was upon it, as were others looking for judgeships, and those who hoped to succeed to the office of Attorney General. Lord Derby said of the Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, that it was worth so much waste paper. From 1852 to 1865 the debates on the ballot showed an increasing malversation of practice. The old constituencies and the new rivalled each other as regards intimidation, and if I want proof of this let me refer to the election at Exeter nearly twelve months ago. The last election for Exeter presented a sad picture of profligacy and intimidation; for if the Tories were bad, the Whigs rivalled them. A very distinguished member of the Bar, the son of an eminent judge, and the nephew of a poet in whom we all rejoice—Mr. Coleridge—was a candidate for the vacant seat, and he said, after the contest was over, that the election had convinced him that the ballot was necessary, and he had no idea that in the year 1864 such protection would have been required, and that at the present day men would have been so lost to a sense of what was just and fair between man and man. He had commenced his political life rather late, but it was never too late to mend. He had no idea there was that amount of moral coercion existing, and he should not have believed it if he had not witnessed it. A great many instances had come under his knowledge where many men had informed him they would gladly have voted for him, but they had been prevented from doing so from coercion. Nothing, however, could be much worse than what was practised on the other side, and the Exeter Tory papers complain of intimidation to a vast extent. I have received a letter from Sir John Bowring, who is a resident of Exeter, and he says that never in his experience had he seen intimidation so rife in Exeter as at the last election. The Tory papers of that city complained, amongst other things, of the intimidation practised by the Whigs on the clergy of the city; and they also spoke of violence offered to the persons of the electors. There was one outrage in particular to a poor man who had a cart drawn by a donkey. They threw the cart into the river and they cut off the jackass's tail. The people of Exeter were insolent, contemptuous, and metaphorical, and they said that at the next general election that was not the only Tory donkey that would lose his tail. In reference to the character of the election for Truro, Mr. Williams described the contest as a riotous one, not arising from any doubt as to the opinion of the majority, but from the influence that had been brought to bear to prevent the exercise of the franchise; and Captain Vivian, the losing candidate, said that if any argument was wanting to convince him of the necessity of the ballot the result of the contest would have furnished him with one, and of course three cheers were given for the ballot. I submit that I have pointed out sufficient evidence to induce an incredulous man to believe that we have not improved in our electoral morals, but on the contrary—that we are as bad as ever we were; and what, I ask, has happened to convince Mr. Gladstone, jun., and Mr. Stuart Mill, to cause them to turn short round on the question of the ballot. Both the dominant parties are going to the country, as Mr. Dickens terms it, in an auriferous and malty shower, in the shape of sovereigns and beer, and if the House is convinced that the landlords have, as Mr. Mill says, ceased to intimidate, where is the evidence to be found? Is Mr. Mill actually convinced of it, or is it a mere pretence put forward by him to cover his ratting from his principles. Let us look northward, and ask ourselves why it is that at all the clubs where they bet upon political as well as turf events they lay five to four on Millbank against Morritt for the northern division of Yorkshire. Now, the hon. Member for tbe North Riding (Mr. Morritt) is known to us all, and as I believe no hon. Member has carried out his political opinions better than he has, why is he to be removed? It would appear marvellous were not the real cause known—namely, that the late Duke of Cleveland was a Tory and the present Duke is a Whig, and that, therefore, all those men who supported Mr. Morritt at the last election will now vote against him. Of course, being mere voting machines of the Duke of Cleveland's, they must do it. They have no consciences—nobody ever thinks they have a right to exercise the franchise. I will next take the southern division of Durham, and ask, why instead of one there will be two Liberals returned for that division of the county? Why, simply because it is overshadowed by Raby Castle, and the present Duke being a Whig, these free and independent electors, as you call them, but voting machines, as I venture to think them, must vote according to the orders of their landlord. Before I leave Yorkshire I will take a trip to the borough of Ripon. There used to live at Fountains Abbey Miss Lawrence, a lady who was very much respected, but she in good time left this world, and the property fell into the hands of Earl De Grey and Ripon. The borough of Ripon was a place of refuge for every Tory gentleman who could not obtain a seat for any other place. It was a refuge for the destitute. There he found a home and comfortable quarters, and I dare say very good Members of Parliament they turned out. When the property fell into the hands of Earl De Grey and Ripon it turned out there was not a sounder Whig borough in England than Ripon, and if I were called upon to point out one more good honest reformer than another it is Earl De Grey and Ripon. The voting machines at Ripon do not, however, like the position in which they are placed, and they have presented a petition to the House of Lords since Earl De Grey and Ripon has been their ruler in favour of the ballot, and I believe that nothing would please Earl De Grey and Ripon better than for them to vote by ballot. I think we have reason to say that the state of things which existed up to 1865 will continue during the ensuing elections, so that to tell the electors they can vote free and independent is a misnomer, for they can do nothing of the kind, except to their cost. Mr. Brougham, thirty-five years ago, alluded to the power of landlords over tenants in a way I cannot approach. That eminent statesman said—

> "Watch the proceedings of a landlord with his tenants, and mark how he seeks to extinguish in them all sense of public obligation."

And how could we come to any other conclusion when we see what is the result? Before I conclude my remarks upon, or rather my review of, Gladstone on Mill, let me earnestly entreat the attention of the House to an extract from a speech made last autumn, the authority of which will be acknowledged by Mr. Gladstone, junior, and by Mr. Mill—

> "What is at stake (said this speaker) is nothing less than the vitality of the representative body. If ever the majority, or a preponderating portion of the Members, represent only their own pockets, we shall have indeed what Mr. Disraeli calls a Venetian constitution, and that in a very bad form. It would be a great mistake to suppose that we have seen the worst of this evil. I am persuaded we are only at the beginning of it when we see the number of persons constantly becoming wealthy, whose sole anxiety is to attain what alone wealth has not given them—namely, position. It is this class of persons who make this evil an increasing one — the vulgar rich — to whom it is worth while to spend any amount of money for the sake of distinction in society."

The gentleman who made this speech in 1864, standing by the ballot, and pointing out the ballot as the only remedy for this state of things, is the very Mr. Mill who, in 1865, turns round and opposes it. I say nothing of the insult to this House by the phrase "vulgar rich," because if there is anything we are more proud of than another it is the men amongst us who have made their fortunes by trade and commerce; but what an insult to the City of London if this Mill from off a shelf in the India House is thus to treat its representatives —its Rothschilds, its Crawfords, its Goschens, and its Dukes—who have all made their money by commerce. I think, instead of Mr. Mill giving me a quietus, I have now from his own mouth given him one. Now, I come to what ingratiated Mr. Mill with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and made my right hon. Friend point him out as a fit tutor for his son, and likewise it is an argument which my noble Friend (Viscount Palmerston) has sometimes indulged in when he has wished to give me a quietus in this House—namely, that in a free country voting for a Member of Parliament is a public act and ought to be performed in the face of the people, and that the manner in which the elector exercises his privilege ought to be the subject of comment and criticism for the entire community. This is an argument I have often heard from the noble Lord at the head of the Government and from Lord John Russell, but if it is so necessary that the act of the voter should be so public, have we no precedents to the contrary? Let us inquire into that a little. There were great men before Agamemnon, and there were great statesmen before the noble Lord, although I, for one, can do and say nothing to detract from his merits. Now, on this point of protection to the voter (not by means of the ballot, but a general protection by secrecy) we have the highest authority. We have the authority of the great founders of English liberty — those men who guided the counsels of what Lord Macaulay said were the greatest of England's parliaments—Sir Edward Coke, Sir John Elliot, John Hampden, John Pym, and Selden; and they have left their testimony on the Journals of this House. I will venture to state the remarkable case to which I allude, and which is not a little interesting. On the 17th of April in 1628, by the Report of the Committee of Privilege, which Committee included the great names I have mentioned, it is stated that in the election for Yorkshire certain electors presented themselves to vote. They answered the questions put to them satisfactorily as to their having the 40*s.* freehold and being resident in the county; but, on being asked their names, they declined to give them, on the ground that they would expose themselves to the displeasure of certain powerful personages. They claimed the right, notwithstanding, to have their votes recorded, and it was done. A petition was presented against the return of Sir H. Bellasis and Sir Thomas Wentworth, on the ground that these votes were improperly recorded. The Committee declared that the declaration of their names need not be required, and that it was unnecessary to insert the names of freeholders in the indenture of return, because notice might be taken of it to their detriment, and it accordingly reported that Bellasis and Wentworth were duly elected. The House the same day, by a unanimous resolution, confirming the judgment of the Committee, declaring that if the name of a freeholder was demanded at the poll by the sheriff, and he declined to give it, he should not thereby be disabled from voting. This is not exactly a case on all fours with the ballot, but it affirms the principle, and no man can rail the stamp off that document. Is not this an answer to the frivolous plea that secrecy is cowardly, unmanly, and un-English? If not, it must fall with the galaxy of great names I have mentioned. I have on former occasions referred to an argument which the present Lord Chancellor, when Sir Richard Bethell, completely upset. It has been said that the voter has no personal beneficial interest in the franchise, and that he is a trustee who acts for the non-elector as well as for himself. But what is the operation of that doctrine? At an election for Cork, the priests, who were then in the interest of Lords Palmerston and Russell, told the non-electors to watch the polling-booths, and see how their trustees voted. They did so, and all those who voted for General Chatterton, the Conservative candidate, were denounced as false trustees; and, accordingly, the non-electors broke their heads and stoned them. He would call the attention of the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) to a case which occurred at Salford. An individual of the name of Stork placed a board in his window with the following inscription:—

> "All persons residing in this street and the neighbouring courts who have no votes, are requested to call and tell me whether I must vote for Garnett or Brotherton at the ensuing election."

This notice brought a number of persons to his shop, all of whom being *bonâ fide* non-electors, were requested to sign their names, and write opposite to them the name of the candidate of their choice. The poll was kept open till ten o'clock, and then Mr. Stork put forth the following state of the poll:—

> "In favour of my voting for Brotherton, 57; in favour of my voting for Garnett, 23; majority for Brotherton, 34. Consequently I shall vote for Brotherton."

If that be not the *reductio ad absurdum* of the noble Lord's argument, I do not know where it can be found. He did vote for Brotherton, and so represented the non-electors. The man whom the law invested with the duty of voting disfranchised himself and enfranchised those whom the law declared to be unfit to vote. If the non-electors were to dictate to the electors, it would be much better to have universal suffrage to give them votes and allow them to vote themselves. Mr. Grote called the ballot the silent vindicator of liberty. Demosthenes—mark what Demosthenes said—addressing a jury he said—

> "You vote in secret. You have nothing to fear, for safety is secured to you by the wisest legislation our lawgivers ever knew."

He now asked the House to adopt his Resolution, and thus give practical effect to the words of Demosthenes.

Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "as a General Election is impending, and as we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters nor prevent Bribery, it is therefore expedient that a trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot."—(*Mr. Henry Berkeley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

VISCOUNT **PALMERSTON**: Sir, my hon. Friend said, I imagined that on some occasions I had given him his quietus. Now, I should be very sorry to give him his quietus, for I am sure the House will agree with me that the annual exhibition of my hon. Friend is very amusing and highly diverting, and therefore I should be sorry to give him his quietus, and so prevent him from affording us the treat we are now enjoying. The arguments which my hon. friend has used are those which he has often repeated; and the arguments which I would suggest can only be those which I have often repeated. It is often said—my hon. Friend has often said it—that nothing new can be urged against the ballot. Truth is not new, and nothing is stronger than truth; and therefore if I were called upon to say something new against the ballot, I could only use weaker arguments than those which I used before. My objections to the ballot may be comprised in a short statement. My hon. Friend has to-night given a somewhat different description of the nature of the vote from that which he gave on former occasions. I think on former occasions he treated the vote as a personal right—as a right which the voter was entitled to exercise without exposing himself to any consequences arising from the way in which he might use it; but to-night he has represented the vote as a function confided to the elector for the benefit of the nation at large. [Mr. H. BERKELEY intimated his dissent.] Then my hon. Friend does not adopt this view, but falls back on the ground that the vote is a personal right which the person is entitled to exercise freely without being liable to any consequences. Well, if the vote be a personal right, on what ground does my hon. Friend punish a man for taking money for his vote? If the elector possesses the vote as a personal right, he is entitled to exercise it from whatever motive he pleases. He may exercise it from personal affection, from political agreement, or for personal advantage. The moment you narrow the vote by describing it as a personal right, you take away the ground on which you now punish a man for the corrupt exercise of the franchise. But I deny that the vote is a personal right. I say it is a trust. Even if universal suffrage were adopted, it would be a trust which each person would have confided to him for the benefit of the nation. I say, therefore, that, not only according to the English Constitution, but according to the sense of mankind, the man who holds a trust for others is bound to account to them for the manner in which he exercised the trust so held. I hold, then, that the ballot, the object of which is to screen the trustees, to screen men from the consequences following on the exercise of their votes, is contrary to the British Constitution, contrary to common sense, contrary to the nature of things themselves. But my hon. Friend thinks that the ballot would free the voter from those influences which mankind never can be free from. He has given us examples of the places in which territorial possessions have changed from the hands of owners professing one set of political opinions to those of persons holding other political views, and he has stated that these changes have made a change in the exercise of the franchise. But men must be influenced by one cause or another, and it is a natural thing that there should be harmony between the proprietors of land and those who carry on their occupations under them. Whether it be territorial influence, whether it be the influence of mercantile wealth, or whether it be the influence of commercial engagements, you cannot divest mankind of those influences which are inherent in the nature of things, and must influence the conduct of men. I contend it is a perfect fallacy to affirm that secret voting would prevent the exercise of the influence of the landlord, the merchant, or the customer. Any person in any one of these capacities who might think he could influence a voter, would ask him to promise his vote. If my hon. Friend thinks that the promise made under such circumstances would be broken, he pronounces the strongest condemnation of the voters; because, he says, they would promise one thing to-day and do a different thing to-morrow. Now, I do not believe that. I believe that if the landlord or employer, thinking he might have a legitimate right to influence a voter's conduct, should go to him and say, "Promise me so and so," the man, if he wished to perform the act, would make the promise. If he refused, the landlord or employer would know what that meant, so that the voter would be exposed to exactly the same influences as he is at present. I think, therefore, that the ballot would be inconsistent with the principles on which human society is constituted; I think it would be at variance with the principles of the British Constitution; and I think it would be immoral in its effects, for if it accomplished the object which few have in view, and enabled a man to break his promise, instead of raising the character of the voter of the country, it would degrade him in his own esteem and lower that character in the eyes of the world.

Mr. H. BERKELEY: I think I answered the speech of the noble Lord before he made it.

Question put:—The House *divided:*—Ayes 74; Noes 118: Majority 44.

Another Amendment proposed,

To add after the word "That," in the Original Question, the words "this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Supply."—(*Viscount Palmerston.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Words *added:* — Original Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Viscount Palmerston

Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

PENALTIES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 213.] THIRD READING.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

Sir CHARLES DOUGLAS merely rose to thank the right hon. Gentleman for this Bill which was for the same object as that which he (Sir Charles Douglas) had last night withdrawn, respecting "the discretionary powers of Justices of the Peace;" but he must record his protest against one principle it appeared to recognize—namely, that of committing an offender to prison for a longer period for non-payment of a pecuniary penalty, than the law allowed as a punishment for the offence itself, for which the fine could be inflicted.

Motion *agreed to* Bill read 3° accordingly, and *passed.*

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT (1856) AMENDMENT BILL.

Bill "to continue and amend 'The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856,'" *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 219.]

COLONIAL DOCKS LOANS.

Resolution [June 15] *reported.*

"That it is expedient to empower the Commissioners of the Treasury to make issues out of the Consolidated Fund to an amount not exceeding in the whole £300,000 to be from time to time advanced by the Commissioners of the Admiralty, by way of loan, in aid of the construction of Docks in British Possessions."

Resolution *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Lord Clarence Paget and Mr. Childers.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 226.]

CARRIERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law for the more effectual protection of Carriers for hire.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Hutt.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 224.]

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

Bill *presented,* and read 1°. [Bill 227.]

TURNPIKE TRUSTS ARRANGEMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baring, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the fifteenth year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate arrangements for the relief of Turnpike Trusts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baring and Sir George Grey.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 225.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 19, 1865.

MINUTES.]—*Took the Oath*—The Viscount Gort, a Representative Peer for Ireland.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Statute Law Revision * (172) [h.l.]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment * (175); Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) * (176); Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions * (177); Penalties Law Amendment * (178).

Second Reading—Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment * (106); Trespass (Scotland) * (146); Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment * (125); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * (157); Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c., Amendment * (160); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) * (154); Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment * (136); Procurators (Scotland) * (153); Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland) * (128); Colonial Laws Validity * (158); Colonial Marriages Validity * (159); Defence Act (1860) Amendment * (152).

Select Committee — *Report* — Mortgage Debentures * (173); Land Debentures * (112); Land Debentures (Ireland) * (113).

Report—Mortgage Debentures * (174); Union Chargeability * (171).

Third Reading — Dockyard Extensions * (143); Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment * (117); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) * (147) and *passed*.

Withdrawn —Railway Passengers (149).

Royal Assent — Commissioners of Supply Meetings (Scotland) [28 *Vict.* c. 38]; District Church Tithes [28 *Vict.* c. 42]; Inclosure (No. 2) [28 *Vict.* c. 39]; Lancaster Court of Chancery [28 *Vict.* c. 40]; Married Women's Property (Ireland) [28 *Vict.* c. 43]; Pilotage Order Confirmation [28 *Vict.* c. 59]; Common Law Courts (Fees) [28 *Vict.* c. 45]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) [28 *Vict.* c. 41]; Dogs Regulation (Ireland) [28 *Vict.* c. 50]; Courts of Justice Concentration (Site) [28 *Vict.* c. 49]; Courts of Justice Building [28 *Vict.* c. 48]; Militia Ballots Suspension [28 *Vict.* c. 46]; Militia Pay [28 *Vict.* c. 47].

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL.

PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

The LORD CHANCELLOR *presented* a Bill for promoting the Revision of the Statute Law and expurgation of the Statute Book. The statutes of the realm were at present contained in forty-four quarto volumes. The Bills presented by him on former occasions, and which had passed into law, carried the revision and expurgation down to the reign of James II. inclusive, and the Bill which he had now the honour to introduce completed the entire work of revision. He was happy to say that if this Bill passed into a law the new edition of the whole of the living statutes which would follow would probably be comprised in ten volumes only, of the same average size as at present. This, however, was by no means the end of the work. The next step would be to arrange the Statute Law in the form of a digest, under the most appropriate heads, forming a complete analytical arrangement, and then to revise and expurgate the unwieldly and still increasing mass of the decided cases, reducing them to such as constituted the body of existing authorities, and which might in their turn be digested and arranged. Their Lordships would be glad to hear that the House of Commons had voted a sum of money for this purpose, and he trusted that the work would go on successfully until the whole of the written and unwritten law was ascertained, reduced into order, and brought within a reasonable compass.

Bill for promoting the Revision of the Statute Law by repealing certain Enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary—Was *presented* by The Lord Chancellor; read 1ª. (No. 172.)

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

The LORD CHAMBERLAIN (Viscount Sydney) *reported* the Queen's Answer to the Address of Tuesday last as follows:—

"Your loyal and dutiful Address upon the birth of the Prince, my Grandson, afforded me much satisfaction; and I thank you for the affectionate interest which you have expressed in the domestic happiness of myself and my family."

THE SLAVE TRADE—OBSERVATIONS.

Lord BROUGHAM, in asking his noble Friend the Foreign Secretary for the production of the Slave Trade Papers, stated, that since he last addressed the House on this subject he had received information of very important proceedings at Madrid. A Society for Slave Emancipation had been formed, consisting of persons important in the community, and some of them formerly in office. The Court had not opposed, though it had not aided this proceeding. The press also had taken a salutary direction, for though the Cuba planters had set up a paper on the side of slavery, *The Isla de Cuba*, a journal in opposition had been established with success, and he heard that feelings of reprobation of the course taken by the Government were spreading.

Earl RUSSELL said, that the Slave Trade Papers were very voluminous, and would take ten days or a fortnight longer to prepare them. They would, however, be laid upon the table of both Houses as soon as possible. He thought it right to state that there was a greater disposition than he ever remembered, not only in Spain, but in other countries, to concur in measures for the effectual suppression of the slave trade. There had been a very great change in this respect in Cuba within the last five years, as well as in the United States. The fitting out of slave vessels at New York had been entirely put a stop to, and those who had been found guilty of participating in slave trade ventures were punished with the utmost severity by the Government of the United States. They were willing to co-operate with us in measures with a view to extinguish the trade, and there was now a reasonable hope that the trade would be effectually abolished.

Lord BROUGHAM said, that the conduct of the United States Government had been perfect upon the subject of slavery, and he was astonished at the utterly groundless reports which injudicious friends of the Northern party had propagated of him, as if he had taken the part of the slave traders and slave mongers in the South. Nothing could be more utterly false than such a story, and he took this opportunity of giving it a peremptory contradiction.

IRISH POOR LAW UNIONS—PETITION.

The Earl of GRANARD, on presenting a petition from the Board of Guardians of Longford, praying for a re-adjustment of the boundaries of the Longford Union, said, the petitioners complained that the area of the Union for rating purposes was insufficient, and called the attention of the House to the necessity for a revision of the boundaries of unions in Ireland. He hoped that between this and the next Session the question of a revision of the boundaries of the Irish unions would engage the attention of the Government.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that there were other unions in Ireland smaller than the Longford Union. It was the opinion of the Irish Poor Law Commissioners that it would not be desirable in general to revise the unions in Ireland, and the Portumna Union was the only other union which joined in the case made by that of Longford. Under these circumstances he could hold out no hope that the Government would propose the revision advocated by his noble Friend.

The Earl of CLANCARTY expressed his opinion that, as the circumstances of Ireland had very much changed since the unions were divided, some alteration was necessary. The numbers in the Irish unions were diminishing, and whatever force the argument in favour of union chargeability might have, as regarded England, it certainly did not apply to Ireland.

Petition to lie on the table.

RAILWAY PASSENGERS BILL—(No. 149.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl GRANVILLE desired to ask the noble and learned Lord (Lord St. Leonards) whether it was really his intention to proceed with the Bill. The whole subject was now under the consideration of the Government, and this Bill would deal with only a very small portion of it. The Government were fully alive to the importance of the subject. On occasion of a serious accident that had recently happened on one of the French Railways, owing to one of the carriages having caught fire, and the passengers were unable to escape owing to the doors being locked, the Board of Trade wrote to all the railway companies suggesting that on no occasion should both doors be locked, and the answer was unanimously in favour of adopting the regulation. No doubt the subject was one which deserved the most serious consideration from the Government and from Parliament, and the Government were anxiously alive to the importance of adopting any measures which might be useful for the prevention of accidents, but the more attention was given to the subject, the greater became the difficulties in their way. The more responsibility was assumed by the Government, to a certain extent, the greater would be the amount of responsibility from which the directors would be relieved. As to the argument of self interest, Lord Campbell's Act no doubt had had a most powerful effect. The Board of Trade sent down an Inspector to report on every accident which happened, and recommendations arising from the report were sent down to every railway company. In almost every instance they were followed, but if the railway companies did not follow them, and an accident happened, their Lordships would easily understand how seriously that would affect the verdict of a jury. If the noble and learned Lord pressed his Bill, he should divide against it, as he thought it was not desirable to deal by Act of Parliament with only one portion of the subject.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE differed from the noble Earl, who seemed to think that the directors of railway companies would take sufficient precautions for the safety of passengers, because the survivors of people killed obtained good compensation for the loss they had sustained. That, however, was not the way in which the safety of the public should be secured. He (the Marquess of Clanricarde) was of opinion that the subject ought to be dealt with, though he agreed it should not be done piecemeal, but as a whole. It was very well to say that railway companies had to pay for these accidents ; but what the public wanted was to be protected against risks to which travellers on railways were exposed every day. Only that very morning he and some noble Lords then present came to London in a train which, on arriving at the Clapham Junction, was twenty-four minutes behind its time, and he was informed that as many as 400 trains, and by another person, as many as 700, passed through that station every day. These delays continually occurred, but they passed unnoticed, and those who were exposed to risk by them had no redress. Under the old coaching system the guard was compelled to register the time when he arrived at each stopping-place, and in every case of delay some penalty was incurred. A somewhat similar regulation was adopted on railways in regard to times of arriving at stations, but as there was no penalty for irregularity it produced no effect. He thought there ought to be some Government Department whose duty it should be to call railway companies to account, not only when persons were killed, but when they were exposed to danger by delays or any other causes. He trusted that the subject would be considered by the Government during the recess, and that one of the first Bills introduced next Session would be for the formation of a Government Department for that purpose.

Lord TAUNTON doubted whether it were wise for a piece of small legislation like this to interfere with the direction and responsibility of railway directors. The only approach to a railway accident he had ever personally seen was on an Austrian railway, where the directors were compelled to send in their time-bills to a Government Department, and were fined for every five minutes that a train was late. He believed that it would be best to leave the matter in the hands of the railway companies, although he did not deny that there might be an advantage in some general supervision on the part of the Government. The subject was well deserving the attention of the Government, and if they could devise any plan of supervision which would not detract from the responsibility of the railway companies, he should be glad to see it adopted. He hoped, however, the noble and learned Lord would not press this Bill further at present.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that he had not intended to convey the idea that the Government were indisposed to consider the subject. He had merely stated the general grounds on which it was very difficult for the Government to undertake any superintendence of railways, and he had assumed as a general principle that, in assuming a superintendence they would be diminishing the responsibility of the railway directors. The Government, so far from wishing to avoid this question, were very carefully considering it, and if any of the reports which were made to them should contain any useful or practicable suggestions they would be glad to avail themselves of them.

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, if he could receive an assurrance from the Government that they would take this subject into their consideration with a view to the adoption of some practical remedy he would not persevere with this Bill. He did not think there would be any danger in allowing both doors of railway carriages to be unlocked. On one line he knew that one of the doors was allowed to remain unlocked.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, he trusted the Government would give some assurance that they would take up the subject with a view to the adoption of some measure which should prevent, as far as possible, the recurrence of such frightful railway accidents as had lately occurred. He believed that a very general opinion prevailed that the subject had not been dealt with by the Government in the spirit they ought to have manifested. The reply given by the President of the Board of Trade to a statement made in the other House appeared to have been most unsatisfactory. There was no doubt that the question was one of considerable difficulty, but the public looked to the Government as a quarter from which any remedial measure must emanate. He could quite understand that it would not be advisable to relieve railway companies from the responsibility which at present attached to them, and that any excessive interference on the part of the Government might be attended with that effect. But there appeared to be a great inconsistency in the present practice. Before a line was opened it was inspected by a Government officer with a view to ascertain its fitness for traffic; when once it had been opened the Government took no further steps to secure the safety of the travellers by it. It was not consistent, to say the least of it, that the Board of Trade should have powers over a railway until the opening of a line; but that from the moment it was opened all power of practical control should pass out of their hands. It would be advisable that more responsibility in case of accident should fall upon the directors of railway companies, especially as those frightful accidents which so frequently occurred were generally attributable to the absence of the most ordinary precautions. Oftentimes they were due to the fact that trains were allowed to follow one another too soon, and the proper time was not kept; but they were also owing in many instances to the fact that the repair of the lines was committed to contractors, who, as long as they were paid for their work, cared but little for the security of passengers and trains. He trusted that the Government would give their Lordships an assurance that some practical measure would be introduced for the purpose of affording better security to the public than at present existed. It might be well to remind their Lordships that though the present Government had been in office for five years the subject had not received the attention at their hands to which it was entitled.

After a few words from Lord WHARNCLIFFE,

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE said, that though it would be desirable to confer some additional powers upon the Board of Trade, he thought there was no necessity for such a Bill as that under the consideration of their Lordships. He had never seen the doors of railways shut except for the purpose of preventing the entrance of any more passengers. It would, in his opinion, be most dangerous to require companies to be punctual by making up for lost time by an acceleration of speed; for, on the other hand, it was impossible that time should not sometimes be lost if the unusual quantity of luggage and the unusual number of passengers, which had occasionally to be taken in or discharged at particular parts, were not excluded. There was no doubt that the railway companies themselves had a great interest in the good management of their respective lines; but, at the same time, he believed that some additional general controlling power might, with advantage, be vested in the Board of Trade.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH thought it was the bounden duty of the Government to take this matter in hand, and to introduce some measure which would more effectually secure the safety of the public.

EARL GRANVILLE said, the Government had been considering the matter, and they would continue to give to it their best consideration, more particularly after the reports which they expected to receive on the subject of the recent accidents. But at present they were not aware of any measure they could adopt that would not produce greater evils than those which it was to obviate; and, under these circumstances, it was clearly impossible for him to give any pledge as to the course they might hereafter pursue.

LORD ST. LEONARDS intimated that, after the discussion which had taken place, he would not persevere with the Bill.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading *discharged;* and Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

SINGAPORE AND THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF ALBEMARLE asked the President of the Council, What progress has been made in the Transfer of Singapore and the other Settlements in the Straits of Malacca from the Indian to the Colonial Department? The population of these Settlements were entitled, he thought, to the favourable consideration of the Parliament and Government. At the time the English flag was hoisted in these Settlements the population was chiefly composed of piratical Malay fishermen. Now, however, there was a peaceable, industrious, and thriving community of a quarter of a million, with a trade which might be estimated at £15,000,000 yearly. The greatest portion of that commerce was transacted with this country, and the capital embarked in it belonged to merchants of London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Glasgow. Singapore, the principal settlement, was 1,500 miles from Calcutta. It was true that these Settlements possessed a Governor; but he had no legislative power, that power being lodged in the hands of the Governor General of India, who was necessarily unacquainted with their wants and interests. Not only were these Settlements situated at so great a distance from the seat of Government, but the population was chiefly composed of Malays and Chinese. They now naturally desired to come more directly under the authority of the Crown. They wished to have the same kind of constitution that had been granted to Hong Kong and Ceylon. For five long years they had been petitioning Parliament for this boon, but hitherto without success. In the beginning of this Session there was a slight gleam of hope that before its termination they might be transferred—the Secretary of State for India, after having demurred, gave way, and said he was ready to get rid of them; the Colonial Office said they were perfectly ready to receive them; but the Treasury naturally asked if they could pay their way. They gave a most satisfactory account of themselves, saying they raised an annual revenue of £250,000, which was amply sufficient for all municipal purposes, and for the military expenditure. The Treasury were satisfied, and sent them to the War Department. But here a little difficulty occurred. Some "circumlocution" took place. The present garrison consisted of two batteries of artillery and two companies of Madras Native Infantry. The Straits Settlements, or those acting for them, proposed that there should be three batteries of artillery, and one Native corps for police purposes, and to do duties of fatigue unfitted for the European constitution, with a due proportion of European officers and non-commissioned officers. The noble Earl the Secretary for War gave the agents for the Straits Settlements reason to believe that the War Office accepted their proposals; but some time after, as he understood, the Horse Guards insisted it was indispensable that artillery should always have the protection of infantry, and therefore the proposal of the War Office was that there should be two batteries of artillery and a wing of an European regiment. The annual expense of all these combined, it was calculated, would be £48,000 a year. The Straits Settlements proposed to throw in £2,000 more, so as to make the amount £50,000 a year, leaving the War Office to make what arrangements they pleased. Considerable delay had since taken place, and the Straits Settlements were anxious to know the cause of it. He hoped their just expectations would not be disappointed, and that his noble Friend the noble Earl would be enabled to give a satisfactory answer to the question he had put to him.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that a week ago he might have been enabled to give his noble Friend a more satisfactory answer than he could now do. At that time it was thought another hour would have settled the whole question; but there was some difficulty as to the practical details which it would require the authority of Parliament to remove; and, although the Government were very anxious to do so, he could not give his noble Friend any assurance that it could be done this Session.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, June 19, 1865.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment [219]; Ulster Canal Transfer* [211]; Carriers Act Amendment* [224].

Report of Select Committee — On Chemists and Druggists* [78]; Chemists and Druggists (No. 2)* [84]; Chemists and Druggists [Sir FitzRoy Kelly]* [78]; Chemists and Druggists (No. 2) [Sir John Shelley]* [84].

Committee — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [215]; Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [133]—R.P.; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks* [198]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* [208]; National Gallery (Dublin)* [203]; Fire Brigade (Metropolis)* [153]—R.P.; Harbours Transfer* [216]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) (*re-comm.*)* [222]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) (*re-comm.*)* [223]; Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [165]—R.P.

Report—Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses)* [215]; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks* [198]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* [208]; National Gallery (Dublin)* [203]; Harbours Transfer* [216]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) (*re-comm.*)* [222]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) (*re-comm.*)* [223].

Considered as amended— Greenwich Hospital [212]; Malt Duty* [160]; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks* [198;] Trusts Administration (Scotland)* [158]; Record of Title (Ireland)* [217] [*Lords*]; Parsonages* [205] [*Lords*]; Wick and Ayr Burghs Election* [166].

Third Reading—Sugar Duties and Drawbacks* [198]; Crown Suits, &c.* [206]; Kingstown Harbour* [185]; Pheasants (Ireland)* [193] [*Lords*]; Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances)* [201], and *passed.*

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA— THE CONFEDERATION.

MR. CARDWELL, in laying upon the table copies of the Official Correspondence which has taken place on this subject, said, these papers will be found to consist of a despatch from the Governor General of Canada, enclosing a Minute of his Executive Council recommending the appointment of four Members of that body to proceed to England to confer with Her Majesty's Government on four questions of importance — namely, the proposed Confederation of British North America, the Defence of Canada, the Reciprocity Treaty, and the North Western Territory. On the arrival of these gentlemen in England, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Secretary for War, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary to the Colonies, were appointed to confer with them on the part of Her Majesty's Government. Several conferences were held, and the result of these conferences was embodied in a despatch to the Governor General of Canada, which has been adopted by Her Majesty's Government, and by the deputation from Canada as a record of the views expressed. The papers are already in type, and will be circulated to Members of the House to-morrow.

Papers relating to the late Conferences *presented* [by Command]; to lie on the Table.—*Parl. Paper*, No. [3426.]

ENDOWED GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

QUESTION.

MR. HODGKINSON said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, What progress has been made in collecting and arranging the information required for the Return ordered in the last Session of Parliament, with reference to Endowed Grammar Schools; and when the Return may be expected to be laid upon the table of the House?

MR. H. A. BRUCE said, in reply, that a certain number of Endowed Schools had sent in the required information. That information had been tabulated and arranged, and he hoped the result would be laid upon the table before the end of the Session.

TREASURE TROVE.

QUESTION.

SIR JERVOISE JERVOISE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, referring to the fact stated in a Return (Treasury Trove, No. 297, of Session 1864) of portions of the Royal Revenue having in two cases been disposed of according to directions of the Lords of the Treasury, Whether it is not right that so unprecedented a step as the free transfer of the Crown's Revenue to private individuals should not be guarded by the usual constitutional forms?

MR. F. PEEL said, in reply, that the course which had been taken in these two cases was not unprecedented, nor any other than the usual course. The treasure was sent to the British Museum, and having been reported by the authorities there to be of no intrinsic value, was returned by the Treasury to the finders. There was no objection to this course on constitutional grounds, as it was authorized by the Civil List Act. In answer to the observation that was frequently made that the Treasury did not act with sufficient liberality to the finders of treasure, he might remark that the Crown's rights would be of very little value unless that course were pursued.

ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF DR. SUTHERLAND.—QUESTION.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, In what capacity Dr. Sutherland is employed by the War Department; what pay and allowances he receives; whether he is paid by salary or by day pay when actually employed; and, if by day pay, for how many days in the year he is employed on an average — from what Vote of the Estimates the payment is made; whether the arrangement has received the approval of the Treasury; and, whether there will be any objection to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the terms of his original appointment, and of any correspondence between the War Office and the Treasury on the subject?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the House would recollect that at the conclusion of the Crimean war a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the sanitary state of the Army. The result was that several sub-Committees were subsequently appointed to consider and report upon the best mode of carrying out several of the subjects which had been reported upon by the Royal Commission. Dr. Sutherland, who had been a member of the Royal Commission, was appointed to serve on four of these sub-Committees, and he still continued to serve on one, and the most important of them—that originally called the Barrack and Hospital Committee, and now called the Army Sanitary Committee. The duties of that Committee were to consider and report upon all questions relating to sanitary improvements in existing barracks and hospitals, and the most healthy form of construction for new buildings. Dr. Sutherland's great experience and knowledge in such matters enabled him to render services upon the Committee more valuable probably than those of any other gentleman who could be found. As to the rate of remuneration, it was fixed by the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntington (General Peel) at £3 3*s.* a day, and afterwards, upon the recommendation of the late Mr. Sidney Herbert, then President of the Royal Commission, it was continued at the same rate so long as he was completely occupied upon these duties. Dr. Sutherland's time had since been entirely occupied on the details of the business of the Sanitary Committee, and he therefore continued to receive the above rate of remuneration. His salary was charged to the Sanitary Vote of the Army Estimates. Under Vote 14 a sum of £20,000 was taken for sanitary services. The arrangement made for the payment of expenses incurred by this Committee was generally approved by the Treasury, and there would be no objection to lay upon the table all the correspondence between the War Office and the Treasury on the subject.

Colonel PERCY HERBERT said, he wished to inquire whether there is no Officer in the Army capable of performing the duties of Dr. Sutherland, and whether he is entitled to superannuation?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was unable to answer the question of the hon. and gallant Member, whether there was no officer of the army who was qualified to discharge the duties performed by Dr. Sutherland? It was the opinion of the present Secretary of State, and it had been the opinion of two or three of his predecessors, that these duties were better performed by Dr. Sutherland than they could be by any other person. He was unable to answer the question relative to Dr. Sutherland's superannuation; but should rather imagine that, under the circumstances, he was not qualified to receive superannuation.

INDIA—DHAR PRIZE MONEY.

QUESTION.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, When the second issue of the Dhar Prize Money will take place; what is the cause of the delay of such issue; and what is the total amount now available for distribution?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that he was unable to answer the question, as no information had arrived from India on the subject of the second issue of the Dhar Prize Money; and he was unable to even say whether the amount of the fund would admit of a second distribution.

THE SAVINGS BANKS AND THE NATIONAL DEBT.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENLEY said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the sum of £7,703 4*s.* 9*d.*, stated in Parliamentary Paper No. 328, of Session 1865, to have been paid under the authority of the Act 3 & 4 *Will.* IV. c. 14, out of the fund for the Banks of Savings, ought not to have been paid out of the fund upon which the Establishment of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt is chargeable; whether the sums of £255 14*s.* 2*d.* and £297 10*s.*, being the amounts charged in columns 1 and 2 of the same Parliamentary Paper, ought not, under the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 87, to have been charged upon the fund upon which the Establishment of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt is chargeable; and, whether the several sums charged in columns 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, ought not to have been charged to the same fund?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would answer as clearly as he could the three questions of the right hon. Gentleman. The first related to the payment of £7,703 4*s.* 9*d.* It was, according to the view of the Treasury, perfectly regular, and charged to the proper fund. It was, however, competent for the right hon. Gentleman to raise the question if he thought fit. With regard to the second question under the Act 9 *Geo.* IV., the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt were authorized to appoint a barrister and to pay his allowances, together with those of his clerks and the expenses of the office, out of the fund upon which the Establishment of the Commission was chargeable. Under another Act, however, 3 & 4 *Will.* IV. c. 14, the incidental expenses were authorized to be paid out of any fund standing in the names of the Commissioners. For the last twenty-two years all those incidental expenses had been paid out of the fund standing in the names of the Commissioners in the accounts of the Savings Banks. As the barrister was originally appointed there could be no doubt that his salary came under the head of incidental expenses, because he was paid by piece according to the work done. Subsequently, however, when these payments were commuted for an annual allowance, it was still held that these were clearly incidental expenses according to the sense and meaning of Parliament. They were still so treated, and were charged on the money standing in the name of the Commissioners. The third question relating to the minor expenses he would take next, because it fell precisely under the same conditions as the first. The question here was whether, irrespective of the manner in which these sums were charged before the passing of the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 87, they ought not to have been charged on the Consolidated Fund—namely, the fund out of which the salary and expenses of the National Debt Commissioners was charged. The answer was, that although the 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 87, did generally repeal the 3 & 4 *Will.* IV. c. 14, yet that Clause 68 was a saving clause for certain portions of that Act, and said that the Act should not repeal any of the powers and authorities of the Commissioners of the National Debt with regard to the control, management, investment, conversion, and regulation of the funds remitted by the Trustees of the Savings Banks and Friendly Societies. That section had been construed as keeping alive the Act 3 & 4 *Will.* IV., with respect to the payment in question.

MR. HENLEY said, that the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* repealed in terms Section 21 of the Act of *Will.* IV., which authorized these payments, and re-enacted the provisions of the 9 *Geo.* IV. If the right hon. Gentleman had not given his attention to the subject, and would do so, he would find that the general saving clause to which he had referred did not cover those payments.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would look into the matter.

BISHOPS' TRUST SUBSTITUTION ACT.

QUESTION.

MR. MUNDY said, he would beg to ask the right hon. Member for Cambridge University, Whether the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, under their common seal, was previously obtained for the substitution of the Bishop of St. Asaph for the Bishop of Bangor, as President of the Hospital of Christ at Ruthin, in the county of Denbigh, as ordered by the Board of Charity Commission, on January 24th, 1860, pursuant to Section 2 of 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 71, commonly designated "The Bishops' Trust Substitution Act of Session 1858;" whether the like consent for the substitution of the Bishop of Oxford for the Bishop of Lincoln, as trustee of Lady Conyngham's Charities for the benefit of poor Clergymen in county of Bucks, and of certain poor persons in parish of Hitchenden or Hayenden, in same county, by order of such Charity Commission, dated August 7th, 1860, as disclosed in the Return ordered to be printed on 1st of March last (No. 84 of present Session); and, whether he considers that these two solitary instances in a period of seven years are sufficient to justify the statement made by the Bishop of Oxford as promoter of this enactment, and of himself when taking up the conduct of this measure, as Her Majesty's Secretary of State, and now publicly recorded on the pages of the Statutes at Large, in the following words :—" Whereas it frequently happens that a Bishop of a diocese, &c.," in the preamble, section 1 of said enactment?

Mr. WALPOLE replied, that the object of the Bishops' Trust Substitution Act was simply this: that when a diocese had been altered in which the former Bishop, by virtue of his office was trustee of a charity, then the trust was transferred to the Bishop of the new diocese in which the charity would be from the time when the alteration was made. This was to be done by the Charity Commissioners, except where a right of patronage or any other ecclesiastical matter was involved. Now, the first two questions of his hon. Friend did not relate to cases of ecclesiastical patronage or to anything of the kind, and, therefore, the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners was not needed; for then the change was made by order of the Charity Commissioners, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had nothing to do with it. With regard to the third question—whether the Bishop of Oxford, as promoter of the enactment, and of himself when taking up the conduct of this measure, as Her Majesty's Secretary of State, were justified in the use of certain words in the preamble of the Statute? he had only to say, that he knew nothing of any statement made by the Bishop; but he believed that there were other cases besides those to which his hon. Friend had referred, and the word "frequently" would apply to such cases, as well as to the other two, and then the inference would be very different from that which the questor assumed.

FORFEITURE FOR TREASON AND FELONY BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLES FORSTER said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, What course he proposed to take respecting the Forfeiture for Treason and Felony Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, in reply, said it would be impossible to proceed with the Bill during the present Session. He was anxious to give effect to the engagements which he had entered into on the subject last year, but the difficulties experienced with regard to the working machinery of the Bill had been found too great, and it was now too late in the Session to overcome them.

STAMP DUTY ON HIGHWAY CONTRACTS.
QUESTION.

Mr. TREFUSIS said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Contracts for the maintenance and repair of Highways are liable to the Stamp Duty of one pound fifteen shillings; and, if so, whether, considering the heavy additional expense thereby entailed upon Highway Boards, he will consider the advisability of reducing the amount of Duty payable upon such Contracts?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he believed there was some doubt as to the actual state of the law, but the practice had been to assume that these contracts were not liable to a stamp duty of thirty-five shillings. There was no great reason why they should be so liable, and if they were liable the liability arose entirely out of technical considerations. In order that they might be put upon a more favourable footing, he intended, on bringing up the Report of the Inland Revenue Bill, to move the insertion of a clause providing that the stamp duty should not exceed sixpence.

THE GERMAN ZOLLVEREIN.
QUESTION.

Mr. HEYGATE said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will lay upon the table of the House a Copy of the Treaty recently contracted with the German Zollverein, and of the Tariff connected therewith?

Mr. LAYARD, in reply, said, the treaty had not yet been ratified, but he believed the ratifications would be exchanged in the course of a very few days. There was no tariff annexed to the treaty.

COMPANIES WORKMEN'S EDUCATION BILL.—QUESTION.

In reply to a question by Mr. W. E. Forster,

Mr. ADDERLEY said, that it was not his intention to proceed further with the Bill during the present Session, but he intended to re-introduce it the next Session. He now moved that the Order for the Second Reading be discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

INDIA—LAND TENURE IN OUDE.

QUESTION.

Lord STANLEY said, he wished to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether he has received any Report with regard to the Inquiry into the Land Tenure in Oude, which was now, he understood, approaching its conclusion; and, if so, whether he would state the substance of such Report, and whether the result of that Inquiry went to confirm the Talookdars in all important cases in their holdings?

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that up to the present time he had not received any official Report. The inquiry was being conducted by several officials, and their Reports would in the first place be addressed to the Chief Commissioner. They would then go to the Government of India, and of course he (Sir Charles Wood) would not receive complete information until the Reports were transmitted to him. But he had received information of what was going on, and it went entirely to confirm the statement of the noble Lord. The general tendency of the Reports was to the effect that though it was perfectly true that by common custom the occupiers had not been disturbed by the landowners, whether Talookdars or Zemindars, as long as the rent was paid, yet there were but very few cases in which they had been able to establish any right to the land amounting to a legal right. They had themselves shown the greatest indifference on the subject. The result, therefore, on the whole was to confirm the possession of the Talookdars in the estates which they held, and, practically, to do away with anything like legal right on the part of the occupying tenants to the land which they occupied.

LAHORE BISHOPRIC BILL—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. Henry Seymour,

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, it was not his intention to persevere with the Bill this Session and he should therefore move that the Order for the Second Reading be read and discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he begged to give notice that he would on a future occasion take the sense of the House on the policy of extending the English Church Establishment in India at the expense of the members of other religious communities.

PATENT LAWS.—QUESTION.

Mr. LOWE said, he would beg to ask the noble Lord the Chairman of the Patent Law Commission, What steps it is proposed to take with regard to the Report of that Commission?

Lord STANLEY said, in reply, that the Patent Law Commission appointed three years ago was confined as regarded the scope of its inquiry. It was not a Commission to inquire into the principle upon which the Patent Laws were founded, but simply into the working of the existing laws, and to suggest any amendments which might be made in the working of those laws. The Report of that Commission was before the House, and, as the House was aware, they had suggested many amendments in detail. But he was bound to say that having had the subject under consideration now for nearly three years, having heard a great variety of evidence upon it, and being compelled to consider it in all its bearings, the effect of that inquiry on his mind had been to raise a very serious doubt as to the utility of Patent Laws at all. He was not the only Member of the Commission upon whom that effect had been produced. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns), who was not now present, had authorized him to say that in that expression of opinion he entirely concurred, and he might say the same for the hon. Member for Bradford. [Mr. W. E. Forster: Hear, hear!] That being the case he should feel some difficulty in proposing to the House, either in the present or any future Session, those amendments of detail which had been embodied in the Report of the Commission. The preliminary question in his opinion for the House to try was this, whether they meant to have a Patent Law at all. If the House came to a decision that they intended to retain the Patent Law, then he should confidently recommend the amendments which the Commission had proposed as better qualified than any others in their opinion to meet the inevitable inconvenience which arises from the continuance of the law. But the House ought first to have an opportunity fairly and deliberately of deciding upon that larger question which had not been submitted to the Patent Law Commission—namely, whether it was expedient that Patents for inventions should continue to be a part of the law.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY'S TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENNESSY said, with respect to the correspondence on the subject of the passages made by Viscount Amberley in the Greek waters on board Her Majesty's ships *Liffey* and *Phœbe*, he wished to call the attention of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the circumstance that, at page 2, Lord Amberley was described as an attaché, but he had failed to find the name of the noble Lord on the Foreign Office List. He wished, therefore, to ask the hon. Gentleman, The date of the nomination, the date of Lord Amberley's examination by the Civil Service Commissioners, and whether there is any objection to produce a Copy of the Certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners required by the Order in Council, stating Lord Amberley's fitness?

Mr. LAYARD replied that he was not responsible for the title which the commander of the vessel might have put after Lord Amberley's name, but Lord Amberley was acting at the time as Mr. Elliot's private secretary, and in that capacity he was attached to the Mission. It was a common practice for a Minister to appoint his own private secretary. They formed part of the Minister's suite. It was an entirely exceptional thing that Lord Amberley's name should be mentioned at all in the Return. On a former occasion he had pointed out that in the same Estimate many other journeys by Ministers and their suites were mentioned, and no names of the persons composing their suite were given as in this instance. That was the ordinary practice. There was altogether a wrong impression prevailing with regard to this Return. It was a simple matter. When vessels of war were employed to convey Her Majesty's diplomatic servants and their suites from one place to another, of course no passage-money was paid, but a small allowance was made to the commander of the vessel for table money if the journey was sanctioned by the Foreign Office. In this case as in all similar cases where such charges were in question the Admiralty wrote to the Foreign Office to know whether they sanctioned the journey, and on receiving an affirmative answer this allowance was granted.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he must ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he was prepared to take into consideration the great disadvantages to the harmonious co-operation of military authority and Constitutional Government which arose under present circumstances from the absence of the Secretary for War from the House of Commons? Earl Russell had pointed out that the Secretary for War ought to possess a seat in the House of Commons and should be a person of vigorous character. That principle was a sound one, and when it was acted on and Mr. Sidney Herbert and Sir Cornewall Lewis filled the office the business of the Department was satisfactorily conducted. But at present he did not think that the proper constitutional check existed upon the War Office. The noble Earl who was now Secretary for War had been an ultra-Liberal in military matters, and on several occasions he had supported Motions which, with his present views, the First Lord of the Treasury would probably regard as almost revolutionary. In 1855 the noble Earl, then Lord Goderich, proposed that promotion should take place from the ranks to a much greater degree than had ever been thought desirable by this House. That Motion was negatived by a considerable majority, of which the noble Lord at the head of the Government was one. In 1856 Earl De Grey supported the Motion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir De Lacy Evans) to abolish the system of purchase in the army. Again, in 1858, he acted as teller for a Motion to place the Commander-in-Chief more completely under the responsible direction of the Secretary for War than he now was; and Earl Russell and the present Judge Advocate General supported the same Motion. Was the appointment of Earl De Grey in accordance with what was understood to be the view of the noble Viscount—namely, that the Secretary for War should have very little control over the Horse Guards, which was to be paramount in all military matters? No doubt there was a difficulty in the case, for on the one hand the authority of this House ought to be paramount. Every question of national importance was settled there. Then, on the other side, there was the prerogative of the Crown, which was nothing more than a remnant of that absolute power of the Sovereign which constitutional proceedings for hundreds of years had first checked and then removed ; and that remnant rarely made its appearance or was invoked in discordance with the action of that House. That prerogative, however, had now suddenly been called into activity to place all the officers in the service at the arbitrary disposal of the military chief. In the law there were, no doubt, useful fictions — John Doe and Richard Roe had in their time played a very convenient part—and so the prerogative of the Crown, as to making war or agreeing to treaties and matters of that kind, was an extremely convenient, respectable, and loyal fiction ; for everybody knew that even in such cases nothing was really done without the intervention of Parliament. The noble Lord was about to go to the country—the existence of the Ministry depended upon the personal popularity of the noble Lord, so much so that it was said the cry of the Liberal party would be, "Palmerston and no Politics," "Palmerston and no Principles." But did the noble Lord wish an addition such as "Palmerston and Martial Law," or "Palmerston and Military Despotism?" He could assure the noble Lord that such additional items to his electioneering programme would be most disadvantageous, as the feeling of society and of the profession was extremely strong upon the subject. There ought to be a responsible Minister of the War Department in that House. He had every respect for the noble Marquess the Under Secretary for the War Department (the Marquess of Hartington), and he did not mean to say that any Gentleman in that House would perform the duties of the office better, but the noble Marquess did not really know what it was he was responsible for. The responsibility of the office had only a Protean existence. The other night the noble Marquess said that he was personally responsible for any statements he made in that House, but they did not affect the Commander-in-Chief or the Secretary for War. Such a declaration left the whole matter in abeyance, and made the responsibility something like thimblerig responsibility. Although the Foreign Minister (Earl Russell) was in the other House his place was well supplied there by the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston), who, of course, was thoroughly acquainted with the foreign policy of his own Government, and who was never taken by surprise; but when they had only a lower authority the House was at once placed in difficulty. Men were now required to invest large sums, amounting in some cases to £8,000, £10,000, and even £15,000, in the purchase of their commissions, and yet they were now for the first time to have hanging over their heads a despotic power which could take away their rights. This was a great constitutional question, and the House ought to see to it. The question was a grave one, for they had a rule which was entirely new. The control of the Crown over the army was to be one of a purely despotic character, without the slightest check. It was to be a control based as much as possible on the Russian system. The prerogative was to be stretched to the utmost, and that which was heretofore in abeyance was to be brought down into actual life, and every officer was to be at the mercy of the military chief and those who surrounded him. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) contended that this was justified by the Commission of 1857, but the Commission of 1857 gave no such authority. There was, however, another aspect. We were said to be a nation of shopkeepers, but whether or not we were so we attached great sacredness to pecuniary rights. If a railway took a man's house, or even obstructed his view, the law required an equivalent. If a public servant held an office for a short time, and that office was abolished, he received compensation for the loss of it. But in the military profession a man might invest his fortune in his profession, and if he became obnoxious to one, two, or three of the authorities above him all his property, it appeared, might be arbitrarily swept away. It was said that there had been previous cases in which officers had been thus put upon half-pay, but those were cases in which either there had been a regular trial, or the verdict of society—namely, of the world at large and of that House—had been first pronounced, and then recognized by the authorities. Now, however, a Court of Inquisition resembling the Star Chamber sat in private with closed doors, and no questions could be put to the accuser except such as were approved by the Court ; while no report of the proceeding before the tribunal was suffered to see the light, and if moved for in that House they were refused. The whole of the subject required the careful consideration of the noble Lord. It was exciting very serious attention among various classes out of doors. There was not an officer rising to any rank in the army who did not feel that his position was made insecure and his prospects were injured by a precedent to which the noble Lord appeared to lend his sanction. It was a satisfaction to him to have to refer that subject to a Minister of the noble Lord's high and responsible character, because he felt sure that he would give him a consistent and clear answer. He moved—

"That in the opinion of this House it would be convenient, under present circumstances, that the Secretary of State for War should be a Member of the House of Commons."

MR. VANCE seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it would be convenient, under present circumstances, that the Secretary of State for War should be a Member of the House of Commons,"—(*Mr. Darby Griffith,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, I do not mean to follow the hon. Gentleman through the case of Colonel Dawkins, which has been already sufficiently disposed of, but I shall confine my observations to the Motion which he has made and to that part of his statement which bears upon that Motion. There can be no question that that general principle of human nature, the love of power, affects the Members of this House as much as the rest of the community, and I can quite understand that the hon. Gentleman and others would like to have to exercise that power over every Chief of every Department of the Government sitting in this House. No doubt that might on many occasions be very convenient and satisfactory, but the constitution of the English Government does not admit of it. It is impossible to concentrate all the Heads of Departments in the House of Commons. Some of them must be in the other House, and therefore it must depend in every case upon the particular circumstances which govern the distribution of offices to particular individuals which Heads of Departments should have seats in this House, and which should have seats in the other House. There are certain Members of the Government who must be in this House—for example, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There is one Member of the Government who cannot be in this House—namely, the Postmaster General. But, with regard to others, it must depend upon the particular qualifications which Members of the Government have for particular Departments whether they should have seats in this or in the other House of Parliament. But the hon. Member seems to think that unless the Head of a Department has a seat in this House, and is here to answer charges and complaints made against him, his responsibility is diminished, and the constitutional power of this House impaired. Now, in that respect he is entirely mistaken. The constitutional power of this House to investigate, to inculpate, and to judge the conduct of every Member of the Government is exactly the same, whether that Member of the Government happens to have a seat in this or in the other House. It may be more convenient, no doubt, if a serious charge is brought against a Member being the Head of a great Department, that he be here himself to explain and defend himself, rather than that his explanation should be given and his defence made by an Under Secretary. But at all events, in the instance to which the hon. Member at present alludes, I think that those who have the good fortune to hear and see the manner in which my noble Friend the Under Secretary for War acquits himself of his duties, the complete master he makes himself of every subject with which he has to deal, and how fully he understands the whole matter which he has to treat, will agree that he is as good as the Chief of the Department for all purposes of interrogation and explanation as to the conduct of that Department. The hon. Member, if I caught what he said, appeared to suppose that there was some rule by which the Head of the War Department ought to be in this House; but he is entirely in error upon that point—he is in error as to the course of practice. Until the Crimean war the War Department was united with the Colonial Department, and for a long course of time the Minister who was the Head of that combined Department was generally a Member of the House of Lords. Lord Bathurst, who held the office for many years, was in the House of Lords. The Duke of Newcastle also, before the Crimean war; and when the two Departments were separated the Duke of Newcastle remained in the Upper House as War Minister. The Secretary at War was a most limited officer. I know that, because

I was for some time Secretary at War myself. The duties of the Secretary at War were to examine the regimental accounts, and he had nothing to do with the general organization or discipline of the army. He had to move the Army Estimates, and was therefore a Member of this House for the same reason that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is also a Member of it. When the Government of which I am a Member was formed, Mr. Sidney Herbert was appointed the head of the War Department on account of his peculiar fitness for the performance of the duties connected with it, and of the attention and study he had bestowed on everything connected with the army during the time that he was Secretary at War. The state of his health unfortunately rendered it necessary to remove him from this House to the House of Lords, in the hope, which unfortunately proved vain, that a change of seat would restore him to health. When we lost Lord Herbert, as he had then become, Sir George Lewis was appointed; we were desirous of bringing back the army to the House of Commons. But a vacancy again happened, and we had to look about and see who was the fittest, in our opinion, to carry on the duty. Lord De Grey had been Under Secretary both to Lord Herbert and to Sir George Lewis, and he had also devoted himself peculiarly to everything connected with the army. It was, consequently, my opinion, and that of my colleagues, that he was the fittest man to take charge of so important a Department, and that his being in the House of Lords formed no valid reason for objecting to the appointment. My noble Friend here is perfectly well able to answer for Lord De Grey, when he says that his statements in this House do not involve any responsibility on the part of his chief; what my noble Friend means is, that, for the accurate statement of facts which have occurred, or transactions that have taken place, the responsibility is upon him, and not on the Head of the Department. But my noble Friend cannot be responsible for the future; for what is to be done the Government are responsible; we all are responsible with the Head of the particular Department, and we are all here to answer for and defend what has been done, and to state our intentions for the future. Therefore, it is a mistake to suppose that because the Head of the Department is in the other House it exempts him or the Government from that full responsibility which attaches to anything which the House of Commons may think it their duty to inquire into and sift in any manner. The hon. Member seemed to think that I proposed a very new and suspicious doctrine the other day when I said that the Crown had the power of dismissing officers from the army without assigning any reason, if it should think fit to do so; and the hon. Member says, "Why, here are officers who have paid money for their commissions, liable to be capriciously sent about their business at the will of the Crown," or rather of the responsible Minister of the Crown, for the Crown we know only acts on the advice of its Ministers, who are responsible to this House and the Crown for the advice which they tender. But I say it is a facility essential to the constitution of this military body that that power should be vested in the Crown, to be exercised by its responsible advisers, at the risk of being condemned if it should appear that they have given their advice improperly and without sufficient grounds. The army could not exist if the Crown were not invested with that power; and every officer who purchases his commission or who goes into the army knows that is the tenure on which he holds the commission that he purchases or receives. And, therefore, no officer can complain that any rule has been applied to him which he had no reason to expect would be applicable when he entered the service. I cannot agree to the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, because it would limit most inconveniently the discretion of those who have to form a Government with regard to the distribution of offices. I will say, fairly, that perhaps it is not in itself desirable that those at the head of the great expending Departments—the army and navy—should both happen to be in the House of Lords. That, however, is a circumstance arising from peculiar accidents, and also from the peculiar fitness of the individuals for the offices which they hold. But I maintain that both with regard to the army and the navy, those who represent the Departments in this House, as far as details go, are just as competent to give explanations to the House as the Heads of those Departments; and that the aggregate Government, the Government as a body, are responsible one for the other, just as the Heads of the Departments impugned are responsible for the Departments which they respectively represent. Therefore, as regards any constitutional check essential to the working of our institutions, I maintain that it is perfectly intact and just as effective whether the Head of the Department is in this House or not. For these reasons I hope the House will not agree to the Motion of the hon. Member. If carried, it would be introducing an entirely new principle; it would embarrass the action of those charged from time to time with forming a new Government, and it would not forward any constitutional purpose, while the sense of Parliamentary responsibility is as strong and valuable under the present system as under the one which he proposes to introduce.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he wished to say one word in explanation of the reason why the Government could not grant, as an unopposed return, a Motion which the hon. Member had put down for that evening. The hon. Member asked for the names of all those officers who had been removed or placed on half-pay without a fair trial. It would be extremely invidious to give such a return. There was no reason why officers removed or placed on half-pay should have that punishment aggravated by the fact of publicity. Although, as he had before stated, the cases in which officers had been actually removed and placed on half-pay were very rare, cases had occurred much more frequently in which the officer, rather than be exposed to any steps of the kind, thought it right to make a formal application to be placed on half-pay. It would be very unjust to officers that their names should be given, yet in both cases the ground of interference was the same. His noble Friend at the head of the Government had so completely explained the meaning of the answer which he gave the other night as to the responsibility of the Department that he did not feel it necessary to add anything further upon that subject.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, that what his Motion asked for was the names of officers whose retirement had been compulsory.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

PUBLICATION OF IRISH RECORDS.

RESOLUTION.

Colonel DUNNE who had given Notice to call attention to the state of the Ancient Records of Ireland, and to move—

> "That it is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken for their publication as has been for the publication of the Reocrds of England and Scotland,"

said, the subject was of such importance that the Master of the Rolls in England had brought the matter under the notice of the Government. In Ireland the transcription and translation of its ancient documents and Records had been intrusted to Mr. Morrin. His work met with much criticism; he was accused of plagiarism, and an inquiry was, in consequence, set on foot by the Irish Executive. Every one would of course admit that the value of such a work depended on the fulness and accuracy of the translations; but, owing to the small amount of money which had been allowed by the Government for the purpose, Mr. Morrin had been obliged in some cases to make a condensation instead of giving a full translation of the Record. Objection having been taken to this as diminishing the value of the translation, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed, which admitted some inaccuracies and plagiarisms, but declared that the work, as a whole, was very creditable. Under these circumstances, he wished to know what the Government now proposed to do in the matter. It was the bounden duty of the Government to have a perfect set of these works issued, and to do that for Ireland which had been done in the case of England and Scotland. At present the Rolls published came down to Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and Charles, but a gap occurred at the reign of James I., which he need not inform Gentlemen at all acquainted with the subject was a most interesting period of Irish history. There were no less than 1,200 statutes of the Irish Parliament still unpublished, and it would be of great advantage in an historical point of view if they were given to the public in a collected form. In England as much as £22,000 a year for several years, or £600,000 in all, had been voted for purposes similar to those which he now advocated. In Scotland £143,000 had been granted for the like object; but in Ireland only £15,000 had been voted, and even that amount was to be applied mainly to the construction of a building to contain the Records. But it was not merely their custody but their publication that was desirable. He wished to impress on the Government that the time within which it would be possible for them to collect a staff of gentlemen capable of undertaking the work which he indicated was rapidly passing away.

Colonel FRENCH said, he had intended to support the Motion. He complained that no encouragement was given to the study of Irish literature, and that no effort had been made by the Government to supply the places of the late Mr. O'Donovan and Mr. Eugene Curry, the most eminent Irish scholars which the country had produced. Now, whatever selection the Government should be pleased to make they ought to appoint men who could properly examine these documents and make a proper translation of them for publication. The system pursued in the government of Ireland would not be tolerated in England or Scotland. So far as the chief departments were concerned, the rule was that "no Irish need apply," and the Government thus put it out of their power to secure the services of gentlemen who, being acquainted with the country, would be able to advise them in every conjuncture. No other part of the country would submit to the system adopted in Ireland, and allow natives to be excluded from office. Englishman succeeded Englishman, and the only department at the head of which they found an Irishman was that of education. This was manifestly unfair, and no nation whose citizens were thus passed over and excluded from the management and administration of its affairs could be expected to be contented. They possessed the ablest arcæologist in the world in Ireland—he was the man most competent to perform the duties of calendaring and editing these records. If a new office were about to be created in regard to the Irish records, he trusted that, as an Irishman might be found who was highly competent to discharge the duties of the office, he would not be passed over.

Mr. SCULLY said, he believed there were only two archivists in Ireland. He was personally intimate with both of them, and he had asked them who there was to succeed them in the event of anything occurring to render a successor necessary? They both said they knew of no one but Mr. Stokes. But instead of appointing Mr. Stokes, the work of editing the Brehon laws was given to Professor Hardwick, who, like every Member in that House, he (Mr. Scully) included, was profoundly ignorant of Irish. If the publication of these old musty records were good for Scotland and England, as illustrating the ancient history of those countries, it would be equally good for Ireland. He had no candidate to recommend for the appointment of editing these records, but he hoped a competent person would be selected.

Mr. PEEL said, that it was not necessary to re-open the controversy with respect to Mr. Morrin. He had been selected by the Treasury, on the recommendation of the Master of the Rolls, to edit and publish the Calendar of the Patent Rolls of the Chancery in Ireland. He published three volumes, which, with the preface, were severely criticized in a certain pamphlet. In fulfilment of a pledge made in that House, the Treasury sent the Rev. Duffus Hardy and Mr. Brewer to examine the work of Mr. Morrin and compare it with the original records of the Calendar. Their report, on the whole, was favourable to Mr. Morrin, and the Government gave their sanction to the completion of the work. After the manner, however, in which the work had been handled, Mr. Morrin thought it better not to proceed with it, and since then no steps had been taken for the completion of the Calendar of the Rolls of Chancery in Ireland. The Rolls of James I. had not been calendared by Mr. Morrin, but he believed that work had been already done, and all that was required was that these rolls should be printed uniformly with Mr. Morrin's work. The grants made by Parliament in previous years were intended to apply to Ireland as well as to other parts of the kingdom, and he knew that the Master of the Rolls had secured the publication of important papers illustrative of the history of Ireland. He thought that Irish members had every reason to be satisfied with the measures taken by the Government for the preservation and publication of Irish records. The Estimates of the present year abounded in items of this kind. The sum of £8,000 had been expended upon a commission for transcribing and translating the ancient Celtic laws, called the Brehon laws, and all that remained was to pass the work through the press. For that purpose the Estimates contained an item of £500, and a further provision for printing was contained in the stationery vote. There had also been this year an increase of the grant to the Royal Irish Society, specially to enable them to purchase any Celtic manuscripts, and to make copies of any that might be found, either in private collections in this country or on the Continent. With regard to the grant made to the Master of the Rolls in this country, he might say that it was intended to publish the second volume of the work, he believed, by Mr. Hans Hamilton, containing the domestic papers from the time of Henry VIII. to Elizabeth. In other parts of the estimates provision was made with respect to papers in the Lambeth and the Bodleian Library. The President of the College of Maynooth and Mr. Prendergast had been appointed to make the selection in the former case, and Mr. Bullen to prepare a calendar of papers in the Bodleian for the purpose of this work, which would be entirely confined to the illustration of the history of Ireland. All that was enough to show that the question of the publication of the records of Ireland was one which had received the attention of Government. But the most important thing of all was the step which was being taken to erect a Public Record Office in Ireland, in which the various important papers that were now scattered about should be collected. That building was on a scale large enough to receive all those records, it would be completed in the month of October next, and then it would be necessary to form a staff. It would be the business of the clerks to make an index of the papers, and he presumed the officer in charge of the department would take the same care as the Master of the Rolls in this country, to select the most competent persons to make compilations. He knew the interest which was taken in the subject by his hon. and gallant Friend, and he had no doubt the result would be satisfactory.

THE TREATY WITH THE ZOLLVEREIN.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HUBBARD said, he wished to draw the attention of the House to this subject. It had transpired that the treaty had been already discussed in both the Prussian Chambers, and that though it had not been formally presented the ratification was now on its way. He had received from a traveller a copy, which he believed to be a true one, and it might not be uninteresting to call attention briefly to a few points in connection with it. The treaty might be described in a few words to be an engagement between Prussia and the Zollverein on the one hand, and Great Britain and her colonies on the other, to the effect that the two contracting parties should, with reference to trade and traders, be placed upon the footing of the most favoured nation. It was a declaration of reciprocity, and that only. But there was one very remarkable clause, the fifth, which contained this stipulation—

> "The two contracting parties engage not to prohibit the exportation of coal, and to levy no duty upon such exportation."

It would be in the recollection of the House that when the French Treaty was discussed there was one clause which met with very serious animadversion, and that was the clause in which the Government of Great Britain undertook for a period of ten years not to prohibit the exportation of coal, and not to levy any duty upon it. That clause was so utterly devoid of any reason to support it that it was assumed on all sides to be the result of an oversight. He could not think, however, that the recurrence of a similar clause in this treaty was the result of an oversight. There were two ways in which this clause might be regarded. In the first place, it might be said that the clause was totally unimportant, and therefore might pass without any notice whatever, or else that the conditions to which Great Britain had bound herself were in themselves impracticable, and that, in point of fact, we had promised nothing except what we were really obliged to concur in. He was not prepared to accept that solution, because it would mean that our Government had made a solemn compact on a point either which was really wholly unimportant or that we were practising a delusion on the other contracting parties. But let the House consider whether the point was so unimportant. In certain circumstances nothing could be more legitimate or useful than an export duty, and if they were to look for precedents, what should they find? They found that in almost every instance a new country had begun by levying a duty upon its exports, because they were the first means of raising a revenue through their trade. And what had been the course in Europe? He had been engaged in the Russian trade all his life, and he could perfectly well recollect that Russia had invariably levied an export duty upon her productions. This country had from time to time strongly protested and remonstrated against this as an infringement of the principles of free trade, but the reply always was to mind our own business. Russia had not been able to continue to levy uninterruptedly the same duties in consequence of the competition of other countries. India with its jute competed with her hemp, Australia competed with her in the production of tallow and hides, and thus Russia was forced to diminish her duties, and at present they were hardly noticeable. But we had an example nearer home. In India the late Financial Secretary, Sir Charles Trevelyan, had selected the four important articles of tea, wool, jute, and coffee for the purpose of raising a revenue. That proposal had met with the disapproval of the Secretary of State, and rightly, because in the present position of India there was not one of those articles on which a duty could be levied without some risk of arresting their production and consumption. Turning to the United States, we found that they were proposing to replenish their exhausted Treasury by levying a duty as high as 25 per cent on the export of cotton. Here we had instances in which important countries had taxed articles of annual production, which must, therefore, more or less, come into competition with the productions of the whole world. But there were other products of a different character not reproductive and not exposed to direct competition. There had been an export duty on Sicilian sulphur, but the Italian Government were obliged to diminish it, not owing to the competition of other sulphuric mines, but owing to the rivalry of chemical substitutes. The principle of export duties was by no means a new one, and although they required careful regulation, und that few countries were able to maintain them, yet when circumstances warranted their adoption, they were irreproachable. There were in England two commodities—coal and iron—the exports of which might be taxed without interfering with industry or checking the export of the commodity. In common with many economical writers he contended that they were both legitimate and advantageous subjects of taxation, because whatever duty was imposed on them was so much clear gain to the country, and, if kept within a moderate amount, it was a gain which carried with it not the slightest disturbance of trade, inflicted not the slightest injury upon the producers, and was so much tribute secured from the foreigner in return for our unexampled natural products. Coal and iron were gifts of Providence, and it was the duty of the Government to utilize these commodities for the benefit of the country. From them a revenue of three-quarters of a million sterling might be derived without any countervailing disadvantage. It might be said that this was a selfish policy, and that we ought to allow foreigners to receive freely these products of ours. But did we find that foreigners were as forbearing in the admission of our products as we were in allowing the free export of those products? We were engaging not to tax the export of coal; but Belgium levied a duty of 9*d.* on the import of coal; France, 1*s.*; Turkey, 2*s.* 3*d.*; the Zollverein, 2*s.* 6*d.*; and Spain, 5*s.* 6*d.* There was no reciprocity in an arrangement binding us not to tax the export of one of our staple commodities, while the contracting parties taxed it so seriously. He did not wish to advocate a selfish or narrow policy, but coal and iron were essential to the manufacturing industry of the age; they were also essential elements in war, and the country which could command them more readily than her neighbours would be best able to maintain her supremacy. Why, then, should we bind ourselves to cede untaxed these essential elements of commercial, manufacturing, and warlike superiority to other countries without any equivalent consideration in their engagements? In this treaty there was not the slightest consideration for the concession that was made. Much had been said lately of the hardships of the paper manufacturers arising from the fact that foreign countries levied upon the export of rags a very large percentage of duty, amounting, in the case of the Zollverein, to £5 per ton. Now, when we were undertaking to let the Zollverein have our coals free of duty, it would not have been too much to ask that the Zollverein should let us have their rags free of duty. Passing, however, from the commercial and fiscal question involved, he objected to a treaty which placed a continuous and serious embarrassment in the way of the Government of this country for years to come. What right had any Government in a treaty to tie the hands of its successors for twelve years to come in dealing with the important article of coal? If it were necessary to touch the question at all, surely the Government might have been satisfied to extend to the Zollverein the same indulgence as was extended to France. The clause of the French Treaty by which we undertook to put no export duty on coal would terminate in five years, as five had already run, and under the most favoured nation clause the Zollverein would have enjoyed the same privilege; but this treaty was to last for twelve years, and during this time the Government had abdicated the right of regulating our revenue with reference to coal. He should like to know with whom the clause originated. Was it proposed by our Government or by Prussia, or by some of the minor States? Was it Hanover or Hesse or Oldenburg that proposed it? Hanover was a coal-producing country. Now, suppose Hanover could only produce coals at 17*s.* 6*d.* per ton, and Prussia could import them from this country at 15*s.*, Prussia might impose an import duty of 2*s.* 6*d.*, bringing up the cost to the producer to the price at which Hanover could supply them. It was monstrous to let an article go untaxed from here, and be taxed on arriving at the other side of the water for the sake of the local producers of the same commodity. Had any concession been promised in return for the clause? He did not wish to ask for correspondence, which it might be unusual or inconvenient to produce; but he wanted to know how this remarkable fiscal blunder had originated, how these treaties were got up, who was responsible for them, and what was their object. Did they originate with the Board of Trade or the Foreign Office? Was there an itinerant mission going through the Continent making treaties in an arbitrary *dilettante* manner? The Austrian Treaty was supposed to be on the stocks, and the issue might be a document of a similar nature. It was therefore important to know who was responsible for arrangements which embarrassed the Government, impaired the internal management of the nation, and conferred advantages upon foreign countries without any consideration in their engagements towards us.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he was afraid that if his hon. Friend were to propose an export duty on coal he would find much greater difficulty than he imagined in getting the consent of Parliament to such a proposal. Years ago an export duty on coal was deliberately given up by Parliament as an impolitic tax, as a failure in point of revenue, and as an impost that pressed injuriously upon a great branch of industry. Coal was only won by human industry; and if the colliers were prevented from selling the produce of their industry in the best market by the imposition of an export duty you would be inflicting upon large bodies of persons a very great injustice. The propriety of such a course was fully discussed when the French Treaty was before the House, and the special clause relating to the free exportation of coal was then approved by large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, though speeches against it might have been made at the time. It was well known at the time of making the French Treaty, as it was well known at the present time, that this country had no intention either of prohibiting the duty on coal or of putting an export duty upon it, and there could be no objection whatever to our giving an undertaking not to do that which we never intended doing. The commercial world would have greatly blamed the Government had they, for the sake of some pedantic doctrine with respect to the export of coal, refused a treaty which would confer such valuable privileges upon our commerce. By the most favoured nation clause in the Zollverein Treaty this country fully participated in all the benefits conceded by the Zollverein in recent treaties to France, Belgium, and Austria, advantages gained by them after years of negotiation and after yielding large tariff equivalents. The advantages we gained by the most favoured nation clause, which without the trifling concession of the export of coals we should never have obtained, were, first, a reduction on the German tariff on cotton goods from 50 thalers per centner, to a range from 12 to 34; on tissues of wool from 20 and 50 to 15 and 34; on silk, from 110 to 50; on linen, from 20 to 12; and on earthenware, from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, and some minor articles formerly subject to duties were now to be admitted free. The hon. Gentleman was, therefore, wrong in saying that the Zollverein had made us no equivalent concession in return for the insertion of this clause, which gave that country the assurance that for a limited time we should not place an export duty upon coal. With reference to the question the hon. Gentleman raised as to this clause being an interference with the belligerent rights of the Crown, on the ground that it would tie the hands of the Government by depriving them of the power of prohibiting the export of coal in time of war, he stated, upon the highest authority, that no commercial treaty could affect the belligerent rights of the Crown. When this point was raised in the House of Lords, on the insertion of the clause in the French Treaty, the Lord Chancellor said—

> "The article would not in any way interfere with

the belligerent rights of the Crown. The Treaty was exclusively a Commercial Treaty, and, like all other treaties, was to be interpreted according to the true intent of the parties."—[3 *Hansard*, clvii. 635.]

And that intention, as recorded in the preamble in the light of which the treaty must be read, was to extend the relations of commerce between the two countries. The power of the Crown to prohibit coal as a munition of war was inherent, and was in no way affected by this engagement to permit the export of coal for the purposes of trade. Seeing that the clause in question was identical with the one contained in the French Treaty, which received the deliberate sanction of both Houses of Parliament, and what important commercial advantages this country would derive from the operation of the treaty, he thought the view taken by the hon. Member on the subject was quite wrong, and that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had acted most judiciously in making the treaty in question. When the treaty was ratified Government would have no objection to lay the correspondence asked for by the hon. Gentleman upon the table, but at present it would not be advisable to do so.

IRELAND—CASE OF PATRICK DONOHUE.—PAPERS MOVED FOR.

Mr. O'REILLY who had given Notice to call attention to the Papers laid on the table of the House relative to the case of Patrick Donohue, county of Longford, and to move for Copy of any Correspondence on the subject between the Lord Chancellor of Ireland or Lord Lieutenant and the magistrates who acted in the case, said, that the facts were that the house of a gentleman of the name of Thompson had been burnt down on the night of the 20th of June, 1864. On the following day he had some reason to suspect a certain labourer of the name of Donohue had been concerned in the affair, and accordingly, on the 21st of June, Donohue was arrested without a warrant, and another man who was wanted as a witness was also arrested without a warrant. On the 22nd of June, four magistrates assembled in the ordinary sessions house, although it was not the regular petty sessions day, for the purpose of investigating the charge. No summons to attend the meeting was issued to the other magistrates, and the hearing took place with closed doors. In fact, it was not an open court of justice. The accused person was not allowed to call witnesses, or to give bail—no evidence was given of the arson—and Patrick Burke, the person who had been arrested to give evidence as a witness, said he had no evidence to give. Notwithstanding, Donohue was sentenced to three months' imprisonment with hard labour. This was done, not by the great unpaid, but the stipendiary magistrate, who received £800 a year for his presumed knowledge of the law. The Lord Lieutenant subsequently commuted the sentence and directed the man to be discharged. He had received some compensation, and the conviction was quashed by the Irish Court of Queen's Bench. He wanted to know what steps had been taken by the Lord Chancellor with regard to the magistrates who had acted in this manner, and how far it was legal to arrest a man without a warrant. He understood that the rules of the House precluded his moving the Resolution which stood on the paper, but he hoped the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be able to answer the question satisfactorily.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that the papers which had been laid upon the table showed that the case was one which called for the attention of the Government. No doubt this Patrick Donohue was harshly condemned to imprisonment, illegally undoubtedly—as was stated by the Lord Lieutenant in his communication to the magistrates. It happened that at that time several incendiary fires had taken place in the neighbourhood, and that a positive information was sworn that this person, whose name was given at the time, had threatened to burn the farmstead.

Mr. O'REILLY said, that there was no such statement as this in the papers.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that though it did not appear in the papers, it was nevertheless the facts.

Mr. O'REILLY said, he wished to ask why such an important fact had not been published.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, it would not do for the Government to produce private information. They could not produce confidential communications made by a servant of the Government to the Government itself in such a matter as this. The man was sentenced to be imprisoned for three months by a bench consisting of one stipendiary and three local magistrates, and was committed to prison. But there was some illegality in the forms that had been employed; and directly the Lord Lieutenant, the late Lord Carlisle, heard of it, he took the opinion of the Law

Officers of the Crown, and on their advice the prisoner was at once liberated, after about fifteen or twenty days' confinement. The Lord Lieutenant, moreover, administered a censure to the stipendiary magistrate, and expressed a hope that he would be more careful in future. No communication passed between the Lord Chancellor and the local magistrates; but the Government did take the matter up, and considered that the magistrates acted illegally in the matter.

SHEERNESS DOCKYARD.—QUESTION.

SIR EDWARD DERING said, he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, To explain the grounds of his statement that the important Dockyard at Sheerness was among those destined eventually to be abandoned, no such recommendation having been made by the Dockyard Committee of 1864? He said it was not to be wondered at that the statement which had been made a few nights ago by the noble Lord had occasioned a good deal of surprise, because when last year the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Morton Peto) alluded specially to this subject, the noble Lord, in reply to the hon. Member, very candidly said he had no hopes of Sheerness being abandoned, as it was a station of great importance, especially for North Sea purposes. He further stated that it was a matter of consideration how far other dockyards should be abandoned; but no Amendment was moved in Committee specifying this particular dockyard. The noble Lord said there was not a single Member who was of opinion that Sheerness ought to be in the number of the dockyards that ought to be sold or abandoned. It should be remembered that Sheerness possessed some special advantages. At any time of the tide ships could be brought up close to the yard, and at low tide within a cable's length of the main entrance there was fifty feet of water; and at a trifling expense the largest ships in the navy might be docked in this harbour at low water. He (Sir Edward Dering) anticipated that the House would be of the opinion expressed by Sir James Graham in his place in that House, that any Government that should seriously entertain the idea of selling or abandoning so useful a harbour as Sheerness would be trifling with the best interests of the country. He could not sincerely believe that the noble Lord had formed any very serious intention in this matter. He (Sir Edward Dering) maintained it would be a sacrifice which, if it were placed at half a million of money, would be below the mark. Should he have the honour of a seat in the House in the next Parliament, and the question be brought forward, he should feel bound to give it the most strenuous opposition in his power. He hoped the noble Lord would give the House some assurance that he had no intention of making a sacrifice of this particular dockyard.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, the hon. Member had put forward the strongest arguments that could be used in favour of the dockyard at Sheerness. When on a former occasion he had alluded to the contingent probability that at some future time the dockyard at Sheerness would be closed he did not intend to convey the idea that there was any immediate intention of closing the yard. It was true that the dockyard Committee had inserted Deptford, Pembroke, and Woolwich as the dockyards recommended to be closed, and said nothing about Sheerness. It must, however, be borne in mind that the Admiralty, on taking the matter into their serious consideration, had felt that there were extremely powerful reasons against closing Pembroke Dockyard; and, indeed, so far from closing it they had, with the consent of the House of Commons, made there a new dockyard, so to speak, in which to construct iron ships. As to Deptford, also, after giving the recommendation of the Committee full consideration, the Admiralty thought that it would be a very unwise thing to close Deptford yard at the present time. They had, therefore, decided not to close either Pembroke or Deptford Dockyards; but the Admiralty thought it right to consider whether any other of the dockyards should be closed. When the establishment at Chatham should be really completed it would be the greatest establishment of the kind in the world. It was under these circumstances that he had the other night alluded to Sheerness, in answer to a question; not that he had the slightest idea of closing Sheerness Dockyard at the present time; but eventually, when Chatham should be completed, it would be for the Parliament of that day to consider whether Sheerness Dockyard should not be suppressed. Sheerness had undoubtedly deep water, but it was very confined, the dockyard being so small that it was unfit for the large men-of-war of the present day. The hon. Member and the people of Sheerness need be under no alarm that their dockyard, which was at the present time very useful, was going at once to be suppressed.

Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

SUPPLY—POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(6.) Question again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £841,867, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Post Office Packet Service which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1866; no part of which sum is to be applicable or applied in or towards making any payment in respect of any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863, to Mr. Joseph George Churchward, or to any person claiming through or under him by virtue of a certain Contract, bearing date the 26th day of April 1859, made between the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Admiralty (for and on behalf of Her Majesty) of the first part, or in or towards the satisfaction of any claim whatsoever of the said Joseph George Churchward, by virtue of that Contract, so far as relates to any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863."

MR. WHITE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Government had come to any decision on the question of a weekly mail to India, leaving on Friday. Such a mail would be of great importance to those engaged in the India and China trades.

MR. CRUM-EWING said, he wished to express a hope that the Government would adopt the suggestion of having Falmouth or Plymouth as the port for the colonial and foreign mails instead of Southampton; as such an arrangement would be a gain of nearly three days in the postal communication with India to the whole of Scotland and the north of England.

COLONEL SYKES said, there was an increase in the Vote for the Post Office Packet Service, but he would suggest a mode of getting rid of it, and even occasioning a saving. There were 70,000 European troops in India. The whole were to be relieved in ten years, at the rate of 7,000 each year; making 14,000 *in transitu* between England and India every year. In addition, there were expired men and invalids, and men going out to fill up vacancies caused by death, which would give about 2,500 each way, or 5,000 in all, to be added to the 14,000; so that they had the total brought up to 19,000. The annual conveyance of these men involved a very considerable item of expenditure; and the consequence was that his right hon. Friend the Secretary for India had before him a proposition for the building of transport vessels of a large class, like the *Himalaya*, to convey troops between this country and Alexandria and between Suez and Bombay and Calcutta. But as it was not advisable to land troops in India during the monsoon or the hot weather, these vessels could only be used as transports during six months of the year. It was worthy of the consideration of his right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Treasury whether they could not be turned to good account in carrying mails during the whole year as well as troops during the other six months. The number of vessels was such that they would allow of weekly communications in accordance with the views of his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton, and a saving in the present expenditure might be effected. He wished to know why an increase had taken place in the charge for the postal communication with the West Indies, and why there had been an increase of £7,000 for the Packet Service between this country and India.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, that the question of substituting Plymouth or Falmouth for Southampton as the port for the India mails had been fully considered by the Postmaster General; but the noble Lord had been unable to see that such a change would be attended with advantage. Though there might by it at times be a saving of a few hours, as a rule there would be a loss of time. Southampton had great advantages. It had a double line of rail to London, and good dock accommodation for the steamers; while neither Plymouth nor Falmouth possessed either of those requisites. Special trains would not be run to and from there without danger. In addition, Southampton was within two hours of London by rail. Instead of there being a saving of time such as that spoken of by the hon. Member (Mr. Crum-Ewing), the probability was that a delay in the transmission of the mails would be, as a general rule, the result of such a change. Southampton had as good a through communication with the north both by broad and narrow gauge as any other port, and postal communication, therefore, to the north could be effected as rapidly from Southampton as from Plymouth or Falmouth.

MR. GILPIN said, he hoped that the House would not be led into a discussion on this question in the absence of the representatives of the rival ports.

MR. CRUM-EWING said, that it was sufficient to look into any map to see the advantage of Falmouth.

MR. PEEL said, that as he had been prevented by a count out from answering some remarks made by the hon. Member for the City of London on the memorial presented to the Treasury praying that the despatch of mails to India, instead of being on a fixed day of the month, should be on a fixed day in the week, as was the case with the Cunard mails to North America, he wished to say that the Postmaster General was quite as sensible of the value of such a change as any one could be. The question, however, was one of expense. It must be remembered that the mail service to India did not stand alone, but was connected with the mail service to China and Australia, and it would be impossible to make alterations in one service without making them in the others. The scheme of the mail service was this:—The Indian mails went out four times in the month to Alexandria, both by the way of Falmouth and Southampton on this side of Egypt, and on the other side they went twice in the month from Egypt to Bombay, and the other twice to Ceylon, and thence to Calcutta and China. One of these two last mails went on to Australia. So that there were 48 departures in the year for India, 24 for China, and 12 for Australia. If, therefore, weekly departures were substituted for the present departures of four times a month, the mail service would be increased by one-twelfth—there would be 52 departures for India instead of 48, 26 for China, and 13 for Australia. The increase in the frequency of departure would, of course, increase the expense to a proportionate amount. The expense of the service, as hon. Members were aware, was very large indeed. The total expense amounted to about £390,000 a year; and of that £160,000 belonged to the Australian service, the loss upon which was divided between the Imperial Government and the Australian Colonies. The remainder — £230,000 — represented the gross cost of the service to India and China, and the net loss upon that was divided between the Indian and the Imperial Government. The proposed increase of service would entail a further expenditure of about £35,000 a year, and though that might be probably covered by an increase in the number of letters sent, there would still be a large sum to be added to the present cost of the service. The proposal which had been made by the Post Office was, that the postage to India should be increased from 6*d.* to 1*s.*; and, when it was proposed that a fortnightly mail should be sent to Hong Kong, he believed that the commercial community had cheerfully acquiesced in such an increase, nor was he aware that any single complaint had been raised. The hon. Member for the City spoke of a charge of 16*d.*; but that referred to letters going by the way of Marseilles, the additional 4*d.* being the charge of the French Government for the transit through France. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had called attention to the impolicy of foreign Governments imposing heavy transit rates, and he quite concurred in the hon. Gentleman's observations. The present payment to the French Government was 10*d.* per ounce, but in the opinion of the Post Office the French Government would be indemnified if the charge were reduced by one-fourth; and in that case the transit charge on an ordinary letter, instead of being 4*d.*, would be only 1*d.*; and the charge under the new system would be 1*s.* for letters going by Southampton, and 1*s.* 1*d.* for letters *viâ* Marseilles. This change would enable the Government to give additional postal facilities. It had been suggested that there should be a weekly mail to Bombay, but that would necessitate an increase in the number of vessels running from Bombay to Suez; but, judging from some recent tenders which had been received, that would be an additional expense, which could only be defrayed by an additional charge on the public. No decision had been come to yet, for it did not appear that the mercantile community would be satisfied to pay the additional charge. With regard to fixed days weekly for the departure of mails to India he thought it ought not to be confined to Bombay, but to go alternately to Bombay and Calcutta, the railway facilities from the latter place being now very great. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) had referred to the communication between this country and Alexandria, and between Suez and Bombay and Calcutta, and he also referred to some transport vessels that were being built for that purpose by the Indian Government. At present he believed there were only two running this side of Egypt and three on the other side. He did not know the number of transports that would be necessary for that service, but as the whole of the ships would not be finished until the 1st of October, 1867, there would be ample time to discuss that question on a future occasion. With regard to the West India packets receiving their mails at Falmouth instead of Southampton, he thought it would not be easy to make the transfer, considering the immense docks the company had established at the latter place; but, on the other hand, he thought that if a saving of time could be effected by landing and receiving the mails at Falmouth, instead of at Southampton, and proper arrangements could be made with the railway companies, the Post Office authorities would have no hesitation in adopting it. He, however, doubted that there would be such a saving in the landing of the mails at Falmouth as had been stated by the hon. Member (Mr. Crum-Ewing). As to the postal service for the West Indies, the increase this year arose from their not having made any reduction in anticipation of a contribution from the colonies. The expense of the service to the West Indies was now much less than it had been. The old contract required an annual subsidy to be paid of £230,000; but the amount was last year reduced under the new contract to £170,000. It was also expected that the colonies would pay half the loss upon that portion of the service, but their Governments had not yet been able to make arrangements on that subject, and it had been necessary, therefore, to provide in the present Estimates for the entire cost of the service until the arrangements as to the colonial contributions were made. With regard to the Indian service, the contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Company provided for their carrying Government passengers at two-thirds of their ordinary passenger rates. But it had been thought that the Government ought not to make a contribution towards the cost of the passage of persons travelling between this country and India, and the company had arranged to charge the ordinary passenger fare for Government passengers, making to the Government an abatement of £15,000 from the subsidy on that account. There was not a real increase of cost for the Indian service, but, on the contrary, a reduction. The total charge was £162,125. From this they must deduct £44,000, the proportion to be paid by the Indian Government. A less sum would be paid by the Indian Government than last year, and the reason was that the postage was more. They had to deduct the amount of the postage from the whole charge, and what remained was divided equally between the Governments of this country and of India. The net loss last year was £100,000, but this year it was reduced to £80,000, half of which the Indian Government paid; but, of course, the gross charge had to be voted.

Mr. CAVE said, there could be no doubt that a great saving of time would be effected in the landing and dispatch of the West India mails, both as regarded Scotland and the West Coast, and only in a less degree as regarded London, if the mails were landed and embarked at Falmouth instead of Southampton. At present the mail steamers sailed from Southampton at between two and three in the afternoon, and the consequence was that the mass of the correspondence went down by the evening mail of the day before, so that a day might be said to be lost, whereas, if the mails could be taken on board at Falmouth, the letters could be posted on the evening of the day on which the packets leave Southampton. The same applied to the arrival of the mails. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Peel) two questions. The first was with reference to the Liverpool steamers. A convention had been entered into with the Royal Mail Company by which a certain subsidy was to be paid to them for carrying the mails, and an arrangement had also been come to with a steam-packet company at Liverpool for carrying letters to certain places. It appeared to him that in that respect the right hon. Gentleman had made a bad bargain, because the postage of all the letters the latter carried must be added to the amount of subsidy to be paid to the Royal Mail Company. The other question he had to ask the right hon. Gentleman was how long the French convention would last. The right hon. Gentleman had said on a former occasion that it was an anomaly that the French Government should be able to send letters at a lower rate than was charged in this country, and he wished, therefore, to know whether there was any chance of our putting the French Government on a footing with ourselves.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he thought they could not overrate the importance, in a social, commercial, and political point of view, of increasing and facilitating their postal communication with all parts of the world. Greater convenience, he believed, might be secured to the public without burdening the Exchequer. Southampton was so flourishing that it did not require the Government contracts. He had long been of opinion that our communications with India were not as perfect as they ought to be. More use should be made of the Indian railways in the conveyance of mails. The mails were not sent out with sufficient frequency ; and it was most desirable that the civil and military *employés* of India should be able to visit this country as often as possible, and at the most moderate cost. He objected to the arrangements that had recently been entered into, whereby the whole of the Indian civil servants, covenanted and uncovenanted, would have to pay the full passage rate to and from India. The contracts for India were not on the best footing. There ought to be a separate contract for Alexandria, a separate contract for the Red Sea and down as far as Aden, and then they should have branches for India, China, and Australia, the Mauritius, and the Cape. In that way they might, without greater expense, have a weekly communication with these various important places. An increase of the Indian postal rates was a most impolitic measure, while it would bring a mere peppercorn to the public revenue, and he trusted that the Government would carefully re-consider the matter in the recess. In China the merchants were making large gains, and therefore, in equity, if the rate of postage to India was 1*s*., to China it should be 2*s*. 6*d*.

MR. PEEL said, that the payment to the Liverpool Mail Company was for the conveyance of mails between Jamaica and Honduras. For that service a sum of £8,000 was paid last year, but this company undertook to carry the mails for £2,250, and, moreover, to carry letters between this country and Jamaica at the charge for ship letters. The arrangement had been subject to certain conditions of contribution on the part of the Honduras Government, which conditions had not been complied with, and therefore the Government had given notice to the company to discontinue the arrangement. With respect to the convention with France, he had to state that the French Government only paid one shilling per ounce for letters to the West Indies, which was less than the charge for English letters ; but the total postage on letters from France to the West Indies was not below that of letters from England to the West Indies.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, the right hon. Gentleman had not answered his question—whether the House would be consulted before an alteration was made in the rates of Indian postage.

MR. PEEL said, no such arrangement could be carried out without the concurrence of the Indian Government, and at present that Government had not been applied to.

SIR FITZROY KELLY said, he wished to know why so extraordinary a course was adopted of excluding one particular person from all participation in the Vote. After listening patiently to the debate which took place three years ago upon the subject of Mr. Churchward's contract, he had been unable to understand why so extraordinary a course should be adopted. Upon what grounds was Mr. Churchward to be excluded Session after Session from payment for a contract duly entered into between himself and the Government ? If some explanation were not given he should divide the House.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the reason why the Vote was proposed in the present form had been stated over and over again, and he was not disposed to revive the discussion. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir FitzRoy Kelly) was aware that Mr. Churchward's contract had been fully considered and discussed, and that the House came to the conclusion that that gentleman had endeavoured to obtain a contract by corrupt means—not imputing to the Members of Lord Derby's Government who granted it corrupt motives. The House came to a determination that none of the money voted for the packet service should be paid to him, and therefore this Vote had since always been proposed in its present form.

SIR FITZROY KELLY said, that a charge of corruption had not been proved against Mr. Churchward ; and, in the absence of a satisfactory explanation, he should divide the Committee against the Vote.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

CLASS II.—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(7.) Question again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,482, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1866, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues."

MR. CAIRD said, it was now seven years since he brought under the notice of the House the extravagant expenditure incurred by the Office of Woods in converting 2,000 acres of Hainault Forest into a farm. The cost of doing so was £67,000, and the rent realized was little more than interest on this outlay, so that the fee simple went for nothing, while the public were for ever excluded from such rights as they had before enjoyed over this part of Epping Forest. During the last ten years, however, the revenue of the Crown estates had been steadily increasing, the gross receipts having risen in that period nearly 30 per cent. But one branch of the Crown estates, the Royal forests, presented a very different result. The net revenue, which in 1854 was £13,448, had fallen in 1864 to £7,090. Possibly some part of this was due to the conversion of forest land into farms, but still the fact remained that from some 120,000 acres of land, chiefly in the southern counties, the net rental realized was little over 1*s.* an acre. The original object for which these forests were maintained—the production of navy timber—no longer existed, partly from the substitution of iron in the construction of our ships, and also because we could now import from other countries better and cheaper oak—required principally for "knees"—than we could produce at home. This pretext, therefore, for maintaining in some of our finest counties a dreary waste in the midst of the civilization of the nineteenth century was gone. The time had come to alter the system and to turn to better account, alike in the interests of the Crown and the country, these extensive tracts of unimproved land. In Hampshire alone the Royal forests exceeded 70,000 acres in extent. When Aldershot was chosen for a camp the War Office had to purchase the land at a high price, not knowing that the Crown forest of Woolmer was within a few miles of it, yielding not a shilling of revenue, and better adapted for the purpose of a camp, being on the high road from London to Portsmouth, now touched by the Direct Portsmouth line of railway, and having the advantage of a plentiful supply of water. Since then it had been found necessary to have a subsidiary camp at Woolmer. Then, there was the New Forest, a wild and picturesque tract of upwards of 60,000 acres, in South Hants, but yielding little more than £5,000 a year. About twelve years ago the Duke of Somerset, then Commissioner of Woods, directed inquiries into the matter, and an Act was passed for the removal of the deer, in lieu of which the Crown obtained leave to enclose 10,000 acres for plantations. A Commission was appointed to ascertain the extent and value of the common rights, but all further progress seemed to have stopped when Mr. Kennedy ceased to be one of the Commissioners of Woods. Enough was ascertained to show that no improvement could be effected until these common rights were dealt with. One was the right of cutting turf for fuel, claimed to an extent which had been computed to be equal to the scalping the surface from 300 acres annually, a process which in the course of time had already most seriously injured the agricultural value of the forest. The whole tract was traversed by the South Western Railway, it was within a short distance of the sea, and was healthy and picturesque, and in a favourite neighbourhood for residental occupation. Some of the land was good, and highly improveable. The fee simple of the land and the timber upon it were valued some years ago by the Crown Surveyor at upwards of two millions sterling, and the common rights had been estimated to be worth about £100,000. There seemed to be the elements of a great improvement. If the common rights were ascertained and extinguished either by allotment or purchase, and the remainder dealt with as a property in fee simple, great advantages would be obtained. Let it be offered for sale in moderate-sized estates, and in a few years, instead of an uncultivated waste, that country would be covered with houses and enclosures, affording food and wages to a well employed population. Instead of £5,000 a year, the present net income, the income of the capital realized by the sale, at the surveyors' estimate, would add £70,000 a year to the Crown revenues. This country was too small to admit of the continuance of so large a tract of wild land within two hours of the metropolis. The time had come when it should be dealt with, and every interest could not be otherwise than benefited by such a change. He wished also to say a word or two on the system of payment by commission of surveyors and receivers. This matter he touched upon some years since, and it was then admitted by the Secretary of the

Treasury that the surveyor received from the office upwards of £10,000 a year. [MR. PEEL: £8,000.] This charge formed a deduction from the revenue, and did not appear in the Vote, but he believed that it continued nearly as great as it was then. The charge for similar duties for the Ecclesiastical Commission appeared last year to have exceeded £30,000, so that the Woods and Forests were not the only public Department which suffered from this monstrous system. An architect possessed of eminent talent might fairly claim to be paid largely for that talent; but a land surveyor, though a very useful, was by no means a very high class professional man, and nothing but habit and excessive negligence could permit such men, however respectable, to be paid sums for their services far exceeding the salaries of our highest functionaries, and beyond the earnings of the most eminent professional men in this country. The Office of Woods and Forests ought to have within itself a competent salaried officer, adequately paid, and responsible for his valuation and advice, and he trusted that the Treasury would stir themselves in the matter and put an end to a system which was quite indefensible.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that within his own knowledge inclosures had been made in Epping and other forests by the lords of the manors without a shadow of title, and that the Office of Woods and Forests when called on to resist these encroachments and to protect the public rights had neglected their duties.

MR. AYRTON said, that when this Vote was last under the consideration of the House attention was called to the proceedings of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests in respect to the management of Epping Forest. He regretted that the Committee on open spaces, by whom the subject was being considered, had not yet been able to make their Report. It would be unfortunate to discuss a matter of such gravity and importance in anticipation of that Report. It would, therefore, be better to allow the Vote to pass, and to abstain from what must necessarily be a partial and imperfect consideration of the subject.

MR. COX said, he believed that the best plan would be to allow the Vote to pass without discussion, but he still hoped that some supervision in the case of these inclosures would be exercised by the First Commissioner of Woods and Forests. By these encroachments, not only were the public deprived of their rights, but the Crown also lost the value of property to which it was clearly entitled.

LORD ELCHO desired to state a fact which had come under his knowledge with reference to the inclosure of Wimbledon Common. The Crown had set up rights over this manor. It would be remembered by the House that a Bill upon this subject to define the rights was introduced early in the Session, and that Earl Spencer was much abused for interfering, as was thought by many, with the public rights. The Bill was to inclose the common, reserving to the public a certain space. It was deemed advisable to withdraw that Bill, but since that time Earl Spencer had been offered for the rights, the existence of which some people altogether denied, the sum of £100,000. That placed the public in an awkward position, because, if Earl Spencer accepted an offer, which certainly was a very tempting one, the public would have to contend with a large and powerful company. Earl Spencer knew that he was possessed of extensive rights, and that life was uncertain. He wanted, therefore, at once to secure to the public the enjoyment of a large open space, reserving to himself only certain rights.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he must rise to order. If the discussion upon the subject of Wimbledon Common were to be continued, he should have to refer to the evidence taken before the Committee. He should be sorry to have to go into the other side of the question.

LORD ELCHO said, that it was not a question of evidence but of fact, which had come out since the sitting of the Committee. He simply desired to show that a large and tempting offer had been made for rights which were supposed not to be in existence. He believed if such an offer were made to trustees they would be bound to accept it.

MR. ALDERMAN ROSE said, he believed that Earl Spencer had sold one-half the common without any title at all.

MR. PEEL said, he agreed with those who thought that, the Committee not having reported, it would be inconvenient to go into the question of alleged neglect of duty in not preventing encroachments. He would only say that it had not been shown that the Commissioners of Woods were responsible for the course taken. They had acted as they were advised by the Law Advisers of the Crown, to whom they had referred in every case; and although it was true that the Committee had recommended that no further sales of forest rights should take place, it should also be remembered that there was a second course open, and that was too rigidly to maintain those rights and defend them regardless of expense. He did not believe that these rights were lost because the parties had encroached upon them for any particular period. The reason the hon. Member (Mr. Caird) had given for the new mode he recommended of dealing with these forests was that the present system was not productive of sufficient revenue, and that by adopting his course a much larger revenue could be obtained. Now, what was the expense and income of these forests? The expense was not so much as had been stated. There were 100,000 acres subject to very extensive common rights. When the land was planted and the plantations were enclosed, the common rights were excluded. The planting and enclosing took place under special Acts of Parliament, and if the planting had taken place one hundred years ago, no doubt the revenue derived would be sufficiently large to satisfy the hon. Member; but the Acts were not passed more than sixty years ago. The Commissioners were, therefore, in the position of having a growth of timber not yet arrived at maturity. The only receipts, therefore, that could be obtained from these forests until the timber arrived at maturity were from the thinnings of the plantations. Some years ago the thinnings were more extensive than at present, and the receipts were therefore larger. There had also been a considerable fall of timber. In the course of the last ten years the gross receipts from these forests amounted to £508,000, and after meeting all expenses the net payment into the Exchequer was £270,000, or at the rate of £27,000 a year, or about 10*s.* an acre on planted land. With regard to the proposal of the hon. Member, there were only two forests to which it was applicable—Dean Forest and New Forest. The former was a most valuable mineral property, where the revenue was about £11,000 per annum and was rising year by year. The whole of the New Forest was subject to common rights, which had been ascertained to attach to upwards of 1,000 properties. With regard to disafforestation and enclosure, considering the number of parties entitled to common rights, it was impossible for the Crown to take any step without their concurrence. But if they were desirous that the forests should be enclosed, he was not aware that the Crown would offer any opposition.

Mr. CAIRD said, he was rather surprised at what had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman as to the age of the forests. The Royal forests had been in existence since the days of William the Conqueror; and for many years past, down to recent times, there had been large falls of oak for the purposes of the navy. In Nelson's time the New Forest was largely used for the growth of timber for the Royal Navy. The question was whether it was right to maintain these large tracts of land for a purpose that was no longer necessary. There were extensive tracts of land perfectly open, where there was no timber whatever, where the common rights were of extremely little value; and the proper course would be to extinguish those common rights and convert the land to purposes beneficial to the Crown, the commoners, and the public. There was a great deal of desolate country perfectly capable of profitable conversion into smiling fields and homesteads.

Mr. HENLEY said, he must express a hope that as the House had decided that these rights should not be sold the Commissioners would not allow people to steal them. The last time the question was discussed the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that those rights were of no value, and that anybody ought to be allowed to run away with them. Now, the House were trustees on the part of the Crown, and if they did not like to convert the right into money they ought to keep other people from robbery. It appeared that because the Woods and Forests were stopped from selling, they became, to use a vulgar phrase, "awkward," and would not allow the people to enjoy the rights which they had hitherto exercised in these forests.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

CLASS I, VOTE 27.

(8.) £10,000, Works at Landguard Point.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

CLASS I, VOTE 28.

(9.) £20,000, National Gallery Enlargement.

Mr. COWPER said, that the Committee would naturally expect from him some explanation in regard to this Vote. The national collection of pictures had increased to such an extent since the year 1838, when the present National Gallery was first used, that the gallery was no longer adapted to fulfil the purpose for which it was originally intended. Every resource had been adopted to enable the existing building to supply the space required by the public. As the Committee were aware, the pictures were crowded together in such a manner that they were hung in some rooms as high as the cornice, which was 22ft. from the floor. Screens were also placed on the floor to receive the pictures that could not be hung on the walls, to the great inconvenience of the visitors. Yet, after all, a large portion of the national collection could not be received within the building, but received the hospitality of South Kensington, where they were exhibited to the public. The large and useless hall of the National Gallery had been taken for the purposes of exhibition, and formed the only good gallery in the building. It was taken just in time, when the National Gallery ran the risk of losing the Turner bequest, for the space thus gained enabled the Trustees to fulfil the condition of the donor, that his pictures should all be exhibited in one room called the Turner Gallery. He had given notice to the Royal Academy that the time had come for them to surrender to the National Gallery the rooms they had occupied for so many years, and the Royal Academy were now engaged in considering the propriety of erecting a new gallery for themselves on the site of Burlington House. But when the rooms now occupied by the Royal Academy were added to the National Gallery there would still be insufficient space for the proper exhibition and classification of all the pictures in the possession of the Trustees of the National Gallery. Those pictures were now 750 in number, exclusive of 200 water-colour drawings at South Kensington, and exclusive also of 19,000 Turner drawings, and the building was not sufficient by about one-fifth for the proper exhibition and classification of all the pictures. The collection was increasing annually by purchase and by gifts, and bequests of pictures would be encouraged by providing a suitable place for their exhibition. There were valuable original drawings in the British Museum which could not now be seen, and were put away in drawers. If these drawings could be exhibited at the National Gallery, near the pictures which they illustrated, great assistance would be afforded to the study of those pictures. There were some portraits in the British Museum, which it was contemplated to remove to the National Gallery. Then there were certain pictures at Hampton Court, which it would be desirable to exhibit in London. It was necessary, moreover, to have a proper place for the exhibition of the portraits belonging to the National Portrait Gallery. These would require a building, and the site of the National Gallery would be the proper place for these portraits, even if there were no combination between the two galleries, and if the National Portrait Gallery should remain under different trustees. It was necessary that a proper structure should be raised for these purposes in some part of the metropolis. The present National Gallery was not only inadequate in regard to wall space for the proper exhibition of the pictures, but also in regard to floor space for the visitors who thronged to see them. From the Return it appeared that 630,000 persons visited the National Gallery last year, and one Whit-Monday there were not less than 10,000 persons in the gallery. Such numbers assembling in these small rooms must be inconvenient to the public, as well as most prejudicial to the pictures. Experiments upon the purity or foulness of the air in various exhibitions and places of public resort had been made, and he was sorry to say that the National Gallery showed a greater degree of foulness in the atmosphere than any other place. This was not owing to any neglect of ventilation, but to the crowds forced into these small rooms, in which there was not proper space for them to circulate freely. A building of this kind ought to be a large and spacious gallery, where people were not obliged to jostle each other, but could pass and repass with the greatest ease, and containing benches upon which they might sit down and enjoy the pictures quietly. Such a building should have sufficient entrances, vestibules, and staircases; but the reverse of all this characterized the present building. A National Gallery intended for the receptacle of these choice specimens of art ought not in itself to violate the rules of art, but in its exterior as well as its interior it ought to be an example of architecture. The present building was designed by Mr. Wilkins, the architect, in compliance with the wishes of those who did not desire the edifice to overpower or obscure the portico of St. Martin's Church. The front was set back from the pavement, and the several features were arranged so that they might not interfere with the portico of the church. The object was undoubtedly obtained, for if any one stood near the statue of George III.—that with the pigtail—the building made an excellent vista and a pretty appendage for the portico of St. Martin's Church. The whole effect was undoubtedly picturesque from this point, and there was variety of light and shade. But the effect was very different when the National Gallery was viewed from Trafalgar Square and Charing Cross, for the edifice was not suited to that point of view. From those points it had a low and mean appearance, and was deficient in harmony and dignity. It was not high enough for its situation on that eminence, and was not a building which Mr. Wilkins would have desired to erect in order to be seen from Parliament Street. The first thing to be considered was the possibility of extending the present building, and of enlarging it on a site contiguous to that upon which it was erected. Now, in the rear of the National Gallery, between the northern wall and Hemming's Row, there was about an acre of ground covered by the Workhouse of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, the parochial offices and schools, Archbishop Tenison's School, and five houses in St. Martin's Place and Castle Street. This land it was possible to acquire. The workhouse was not well adapted to its present purpose. It was in a confined situation, and was less healthful and convenient than a workhouse was required to be for the benefit of its inmates, or than it would be if it were removed to the suburbs in a fresher air and where the inmates would be better accommodated. The Vestry of St. Martin's did not object to their workhouse being taken for the purpose of enlarging the National Gallery. All that they required was that they should be paid such a sum of money as would enable them to re-build their workhouse in some other position not in the heart of the town. They also required that there should be built for them within the parish a casual ward and the necessary parochial offices. The trustees of Archbishop Tenison's School were also willing to surrender the present buildings and the site if another school equally convenient were erected for them. If all these buildings were removed, and the site were covered by the enlargement of the National Gallery, the street now leading to these offices and schools—Castle Street—would be unnecessary, and might by an Act of Parliament be stopped up and acquired for the site of these buildings. Assuming that this site could be acquired, the next step would appear to be to prepare plans for building upon it. It would be premature, however, to obtain plans until the Government knew what was to be the site, and no steps had yet been taken for any preparation of architectural plans. Such an extension would afford all that was necessary for present use. It would provide a building double the size of the whole of the existing edifice. Whatever might be built could be erected from time to time according to the wants of the Gallery, and it would be a great advantage thus to possess the means of future enlargement. Before, however, any additions were built, a complete plan of the whole design ought to be adopted, so that every addition made from time to time would be an integral part of the complete whole. He did not think that a plan for new buildings in the rear of the National Gallery would be complete unless it included a plan for the re-construction of the façade of the National Gallery. The new part should be made to harmonize with the old, and it would be impossible to obtain such a building as the House would desire should occupy so fine a site without a plan for its greater or less re-construction. That might be done in several ways. They might remove those portions of the building most offensive to the eye—the dome and pinnacles—and substitute a more elevated and dignified structure for the centre; or they might construct a building with a new façade along the edge of the pavement at the point where Mr. Wilkins originally drew the line of his building. This would give thirty feet additional space between the present building and the new front, or they might demolish all the existing building and re-construct it on a different plan. Any plan that would make the Gallery worthy to contain such a collection of pictures opened a vista to considerable expense, but he believed the House and the country would not wish that this subject should be dealt with in a niggardly or pennywise spirit. England possessed a most admirable collection of national pictures, and the people were deservedly proud of it. It was very comprehensive, and illustrated the history of art from the early development of the ancient school, to those modern pictures which interest the general public. It thus provided the means of amusement for persons possessing different tastes, and promoted the study and cultivation of art. It would be admitted that our National Gallery ought to be worthy of such a collection of pictures and also of the dignity of the country. It would be necessary to bear in mind the desirableness of enabling the pictures to be seen at night, and it would, therefore, be necessary to have proper regard in the new building to its space and ventilation, and to make provision for the introduction of gas without injury to the pictures. The estimate he laid upon the table referred to the portions of the site covered by the workhouse, the parochial offices and schools, and Archbishop Tenison's School. He was unable to give an accurate estimate of the sum which these buildings, &c., would cost, as it would be premature to have entered into negotiations with the vestry and the trustees of Archbishop Tenison's School, without the authority and sanction of the House. He believed, however, that the sum of £100,000 would be a maximum sum, beyond which it would not be necessary to go. The first step would be to make an agreement with the vestry and the trustees for the purchase of the site. It would not be possible to conclude the bargain and pay the value of the land at once, because it would be necessary for parochial purposes, before the vestry surrendered the present buildings, that others should be provided for them elswhere, to which the inmates of the workhouse could be sent. A large deposit might, however, be paid to the vestry in the first instance to enable them to enter into contracts, &c. The sum of £20,000 would cover all that could be paid on the conclusion of the agreement between this and the 21st of March. No further proceedings would be taken by the Government except to obtain a site, but at some future time, perhaps next year, an estimate of the buildings for the new site must be brought forward, and that would be the time when the question of the plan and extent would be before the House, and when the Government would state what in their opinion the new design ought to be.

Lord ELCHO said, he had given notice of a Resolution on the subject which he did not propose at present to move, but which he would read, since it expressed the opinion he held on this subject—

"That the present National Gallery, owing to its architectural defects, and to its not being fire-proof, cannot be considered a fitting receptacle for the national pictures, and does not safely admit of their exhibition at night for the benefit of those who are unable to visit them by day; that, if the present site is to be retained, a fire-proof building should be constructed, capable and worthy in all respects of containing the national collection, together with such future bequests and additions thereto as may from time to time be reasonably expected; and that any money that may be required for the purchase of land at the back of the Gallery should, if granted, be voted on the understanding that plans for its re-construction shall be forthwith obtained, by competition or otherwise, and shall be laid before Parliament early in the ensuing Session."

Having, however, been told that as a matter of form it would be inconvenient to press a Resolution anticipating the labours of the Committee, he should abstain from doing so, merely observing that the Resolution he had read expressed the views which he held upon this question, and entertaining the hope that this expression of opinion would receive such sympathy from the Committee as would induce his right hon. Friend to go a little further than he had done towards the re-construction of the National Gallery. He thought that they might assume two things. The one was that the present National Gallery was utterly insufficient for the exhibition of the national pictures. The other was a question of taste, that such a building should be erected as would be benefiting the great object to which it was to be dedicated and worthy of the British nation. The present building was not fire-proof, and was not a fit receptacle for the treasures of art which constituted our national collection of paintings. The national jewels ought to be lodged in a safe and suitable casket. The subject had been constantly under inquiry and discussion, and since 1833, when it was built, there had been eight Committees and eight Commissions to inquire into various subjects connected with the edifice and its contents. The Government had at last proposed that Burlington House should become the sight of the new gallery, and he had supported that proposal because he believed it would be the cheapest and the most convenient that could be adopted. It would not have necessitated any removal of the pictures while the new gallery was being prepared for their reception. But if the present National Gallery were to be re-constructed he feared that it would be necessary to remove the works, and that they would probably be removed to South Kensington, for that was the point to which all our art collections seemed by some invincible force to gravitate. When

Mr. Cole paid him a visit he implored him not even to wish for any work of art of his (Lord Elcho's) to be exhibited at South Kensington. With regard to economy, he believed the re-construction on this new site would cost far more than double that which the construction on the Burlington House site would cost. The two sites were equally central, and therefore equally convenient. With regard to the Royal Academy, the Royal Commission recommended that the Royal Academy should adopt certain suggestions favourable to other artists, and by handing over to them the present building better terms might be obtained from them in the interest of art, and they might be obliged to put up such a handsome front as Parliament might order. But the House had decided that the National Gallery should remain where it was, and he looked upon that question as settled. The only question that remained to be considered was the best mode of carrying it into effect. His right hon. Friend proposed to buy land at the back of the National Gallery, and to erect upon that site buildings which should form part of the new Gallery. But that would be, as it appeared to him (Lord Elcho), a simple continuance of what had been the bane of the present building—a system of jobbing and patchwork, which must be fatal to the completion of any great and satisfactory work. Those who were liberal in politics were also liberal in voting money for good purposes, and a well considered plan would be sure to meet with their approval. The Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night, in speaking on a different subject, laid great stress upon the importance of being able to light those galleries at night, so that the industrious part of the population who were employed during the day might at night have an opportunity of enjoying themselves. But as long as we had a building which was not fire-proof, it would not be safe to light it at night, though the Royal Academy had ventured to light their rooms. On all those grounds he hoped the Government would deal with the question in the broadest way, that they would invite the whole world, if necessary, to send in designs to be laid before the new Parliament, where the matter would be settled in the way which he believed would be the cheapest in the end, and which he was sure would be the most creditable to the nation.

Mr. TITE said, he could not help fearing that the Government would find it very difficult to obtain the land they would require, unless they should take compulsory powers for the purpose as was done in the case of the Law Courts, and he would recommend them to introduce a measure which would give them those powers. He had no objection to grant the £20,000, which was the amount of the Vote; but he should rather the Government had produced a plan for the complete re-construction of the gallery, as in the case of the Foreign and India Offices, and had stated what would be the total estimate of such a work. The £20,000 asked for to-night would probably go like the £10,000, which was all that was asked for at first for Brompton, and which had now got to £120,000 a year. It was quite idle to think of adapting the present building to the purposes of a National Gallery. They had only to be made acquainted with the real nature of the undertaking, and it would then be their duty to set about it in a bold and liberal spirit.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that this piecemeal mode of voting money away could never prove satisfactory. The present National Gallery was a building to be greatly reprobated. It was said to occupy the finest site in Europe, but it was one of the meanest and most detestable buildings in the world. The building was low, while what was specially required was height. He protested against resorting to the mode of showing pictures by means of skylights. As to the remedy, they might add a storey to the National Gallery, which would improve its appearance and give room for the Royal Academy, but he thought the best way would be to pull down the building altogether. He was sure the House would vote the sum necessary for a new one. Why had they not a building like the Louvre? He begged to express his disapproval of the proposition to pull down Burlington House, which was one of the finest pieces of architecture in London, and he did not think anything half so good was likely to be erected in its place. He had no confidence in the architects of the present day, who had never yet erected a fine building.

Mr. LOCKE said, he entirely concurred in the opinion that if anything was to be done with the National Gallery it ought to be pulled down altogether. After his right hon. Friend's condemnation of the original entrance hall of that building, which was the only good thing about it, and his admiration of the little miserable rooms which had been built at the back of it, he could repose no confidence in his taste; and, therefore, before he began any of these works, he should like to know exactly what he was going to do. As he understood the right hon. Gentleman, he was about to put a new face upon the National Gallery, but putting a new face upon a man did not alter his inside, nor did it produce any greater change in a building. Although a new face might be put upon the National Gallery, the old miserable rooms would remain within, and every disgrace and inconvenience which attached to the building would be perpetuated. It was premature to ask for this sum of money until the House was informed what was to be done with the existing building, and he should refuse to support a grant for such patchwork proceedings. He agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for Dundalk (Sir George Bowyer) in protesting against the destruction of Burlington House. If the site was to remain as an "open space," about which there had been a good deal of discussion lately, it might be very well; but the probability was that if another building was erected in place of that which now covered the ground it would prove to be an eyesore. If Burlington House, which was a very handsome building, were pulled down, what was to be put up in its place? He was decidedly opposed to the present Vote without a full explanation being given of what was intended to be done.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that the nation now possessed a remarkably fine collection of pictures which was increasing in value daily, and last year the House decided that the site of the building for them should be Trafalgar Square. He was surprised, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman should have allowed the Session to pass over without bringing in a Bill for compulsorily obtaining ground for the buildings which Parliament determined should be erected there. The arrangement proposed was different to what any railway company would have asked Parliament to grant them. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to leave standing behind the National Gallery the baths and washhouses, which ought never to have been erected there, and which were most injurious to the national collection? He considered the right hon. Gentleman's plan very inadequate, but he would vote for it, because he looked upon this demand for £20,000 as a pledge that something would be erected worthy of the nation. The Government of the day was to blame for beginning the building in Trafalgar Square. It was an express stipulation that the Royal Academy should only be located in the building of the National Gallery while the apartments were not wanted for the national collection, and he had frequently asked why the Government did not call on the Royal Academy to give up their apartments. He trusted that when the new Parliament met the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared with plans for all the space behind the National Gallery, for a building worthy of the splendid national collection of pictures, and also for proper approaches to it.

Mr. GREGORY said, he had always contended that the pictures at Kensington, the drawings of the great masters at the British Museum, and the pictures in the National Portrait Gallery should be placed in the National Gallery, and he was happy to say that this principle had been conceded by the right hon. Gentlemen. For these pictures 2,200 linear feet would be necessary, but in the present gallery there were only 1,500 feet. It was now promised that before anything was done a complete and comprehensive plan should be exhibited to the House; and he trusted that such would be the case. The piece of ground at present proposed to be taken would form part of what might afterwards be converted into a quadrangle by the purchase of the site of the barracks; but he believed that to the proposition to take the barracks there was some military objection which he could not understand. He hoped that his right hon. Friend would make it a *sine quâ non* that the new gallery should be built *de novo*, and that nothing should be taken from the present structure. No patchwork whatever could convert the present Gallery into a creditable building worthy of the treasures it was to contain. The bequest of Turner alone had been valued at £400,000, and having such treasures of art, it was the duty of Parliament to provide a structure to contain them which should be a credit to the nation.

Mr. COWPER said, he had heard of no proposal to pull down Burlington House, and therefore the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir George Bowyer) was premature in his alarm. There was a proposal to build on the front of the courtyard, but that would leave Burlington House on one side of a quadrangle, and be the substitution of a building for a dead wall. With regard to the National Gallery, the hall had been useless for the purpose of exhibiting pictures, while the alterations made there had converted it into the only good gallery—seventy-one feet in length—to be found in the whole building. In the hands of a skilful architect that gallery would be turned to account and would be of use in constructing a new building. It would be a clumsy thing to pull down the present Gallery entirely; a good architect would leave great part of it standing, but transform it by additions into all that was desired. There might be a new façade, and a new building might be attached to the old building, which might be so altered and re-constructed that you would not know it again. With regard to the discussion that had taken place, he was glad to see a different, and, as he thought, a wiser tone than in the debate of last year. It was true the Government had not got the most economical plan, but by reconstructing the present building in Trafalgar Square, and by the proposed extensions behind, they would, if successful in the architect they employed, secure a noble building, worthy of the treasures it was to contain. The Vote now before the House had no bearing whatever upon the building or the plan; it was therefore not a fair representation to speak of it as a piecemeal affair; it was confined to the preliminary step—the purchase of the site.

Lord ELCHO said, he desired that there should be a clear understanding as to what it was proposed to do. Was it proposed to lay before Parliament next Session a plan or plans for the reconstruction of the old National Gallery?

Mr. COWPER said, that when the agreement had been made for the purchase of the site, the next step would be to bring before the House an estimate for whatever was to be erected upon that site. That would be the time to mention the plan. He would rather not give any pledge on these points, because the proper time to enter into the discussion of the plan was when the estimate was proposed for the building. At present the House was asked to decide whether the enlargement was to be at Trafalgar Square. If not, were they of opinion it should be at Burlington House? When that point was decided, then would come the estimate and the plan for the building to be erected there; and he had also stated that that plan would be made harmonious with the existing building, and would be treated, not piecemeal, but as a comprehensive measure.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, it was impossible to decide such a point until the plan was before the House. The first thing was to know what the Government meant to erect.

Mr. COX said, he wished to ask whether, if hon. Members voted now against the £20,000, it would be supposed they were voting in favour of the removal of the National Gallery to Burlington House?

Mr. COWPER: It has been decided that there is to be an enlargement of the old building or the erection of a new one for the National Gallery, and as only two sites have ever been mentioned, I presume those who do not wish to have it at Trafalgar Square are for Burlington House. If the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cox) is for no enlargement of the old, and for no new building at all, he will vote against any grant whatever.

Mr. LOCKE said, he did not want to destroy the harmony of the evening; but he should be extremely sorry if the Committee came to any vote which pledged Parliament to the erection of a new National Gallery "in harmony with the old one." It would be a dead failure, cost a great deal, and satisfy no one.

Mr. AYRTON said, he thought this discussion wholly unnecessary; it appeared to be carried on chiefly by Gentlemen who last year wished to remove the National Gallery from its present site, and being then defeated were now striving to hinder anything being done to improve the present building. The Government only asked now for the means to purchase land adjacent to the Trafalgar Square site, and expressed no opinion as to the mode in which it should be used, whether for a new design or for a modification of the present one. That was left a purely open question. He thought it fair to give the Government a Vote on Account, and enable them to get the land by agreement, if possible. The noble Lord (Lord Elcho) said that the first thing must be the destruction of the present Gallery, and that then you must run about to find a place for the pictures. But what would be done would no doubt be first to erect all the rest of the quadrangle except the front, and lastly to pull down the Gallery which was now being used. At present, however, there was no plan before the House, so that there was no occasion to discuss these difficulties. Why the noble

Lord (Lord Elcho) introduced a question that could not arise for five or ten years to come he could not conceive.

LORD ELCHO said, he regretted the defeat of last year, but he accepted that defeat; and all he wanted to do now was to stop this jobbing, patchwork system. What the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cowper) proposed was simply to continue the patchwork. ["No, no!"] He (Lord Elcho) said "Yes, yes!" He was about to buy a piece of land behind the National Gallery to erect a building "in harmony with the existing building," and then at some other time—the hon. Member (Mr. Ayrton) said five or ten years—do something else with the present building. He was quite willing to vote the money now asked for on the understanding that the Government would undertake next Session to lay on the table of the House a large and comprehensive scheme for a new Gallery which should be worthy of the nation.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had been much alarmed by an expression which fell from the right hon. Gentleman—namely, that a new building was to be erected "in harmony with the old one." That was exactly what the House did not want to see, and he, for one, hoped there would be no harmony whatever between the old and the new, but a complete design made with reference to the site and to the objects for which the building was required. This, however, was not now the question before the House, and they would have ample opportunity hereafter to protect themselves from any plan which was, objectionable. The present discussion was in substance, a renewal of the discussion of last year between the National Gallery on the one hand and Burlington House on the other. He very much preferred the site of the National Gallery, and was quite prepared to give his vote now in favour of the proposal to intrust the Government with this money for the purchase of the land, which was indispensable for the erection of a proper building on the present site. He should support the vote with the understanding that there would be as little harmony as possible between the old building and the new one, whatever it might be.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he was glad that Government had no intention of pulling down Burlington House. He was afraid that in course of time this fine building would be surrounded by buildings which would be a disgrace to it, but he hoped the words of Pope, in his address to Lord Burlington, would not be forgotten. Those words were—

> "You, too, proceed! make falling arts your care,
> Erect new wonders and the old repair;
> Jones and Palladio to themselves restore,
> And be whate'er Vitruvius was before."

MR. TITE said, that what was wanted was for the House to have the plan of the building first and the site could be chosen afterwards. He meant that the two things should go together. They might take steps to obtain the site, but at the same time pains should be taken to instruct the House as to the sort of building to be placed upon it. When compulsory powers were applied for to enable the Government to obtain the land behind the National Gallery, the architect should be prepared with designs of the building to be erected upon the site. He thought they had waited long enough for the building, and that there was no occasion to wait ten years more. If £20,000 would faciliate in any manner the proceedings of the Government in this important work he should support the vote.

MR. HENLEY said, he was willing to vote the £20,000, but the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cowper) had used language in his closing speech which seemed to commit the House to some sort of scheme which he had in his head as to the future building. That was not fair to the House. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that when the Estimates were laid on the table there would be plans which would present the old building in a shape in which hon. Members would not know it. He did not want the House to be pledged to any transmogrification of that kind. There could be no harm in voting this £20,000, if it was laid out in land, which would be always worth its money; but he strongly protested against being committed to any cut and dried scheme of the right hon. Gentleman.

Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(10.) £700,000, New Courts of Justice and Offices.

NAVY—No. 18.

(11.) £63,915, Greenwich Hospital.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL BILL—[BILL 212.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. CHILDERS said, he had an Amendment to propose in Clause 13, which he believed took precedence of the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet (Sir John Pakington). In 1862 Sir Richard Bromley, now one of the Commissioners of Greenwich Hospital, held the office of Accountant General of the Navy, with a salary of £1,000 a year, and an allowance of £300 a year for a house, making £1,300. He also held the important office of Auditor of Prize Accounts, with a salary of £300 a year, which brought his official income up to £1,600. His health having become somewhat impaired from the labours of his office in which he had conducted himself to the satisfaction of all who had been officially connected with him, in the early part of 1863 he accepted the office of Commissioner of Greenwich Hospital, at a salary of £600 a year, with allowances of different kinds, amounting to something more than £200 a year. On his thus vacating the office of Accountant General of the Navy he received a special retiring allowance of £1,000 a year, being about £300 a year more than he was strictly entitled to, and it was declared that the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital must be treated as a public office within the meaning of the Act. His salary as Commissioner, with his superannuation allowance, amounted accordingly to £1,300 a year, and he still continued by leave of the First Lord of the Admiralty to enjoy the emolument of £300 a year as Auditor of Prize Accounts. Under this Bill it was proposed that the Commissionership should cease, and the effect would be, as the clause stood, that Sir Richard Bromley would continue to receive £1,600 a year so long as he held his office of auditor of Prize Accounts. That appeared to the Government to be a fair arrangement; but it had been stated that he was entitled to receive more—namely, £715 in respect of his former appointment of Accountant General, and £800 in respect of the Commissionership, or between £1,500 or £1,600 a year, besides his salary of £300 a year as Auditor of Prize Money. This idea was founded on a supposed illegality in the condition, in the grant of pension, as to the Commissionership being an office within the Act. In order, therefore, to prevent Clause 13 from having a retrospective effect in respect of the superannuation allowance, he was now about to propose certain verbal Amendments. The clause provided—

> "That if any Commissioner or any officer who is removed from office as aforesaid is at the commencement of this Act in receipt of any superannuation allowance in respect of any former employment in the civil service of the Crown, he shall be entitled to continue to receive, in addition to such annuity as aforesaid, the amount of superannuation allowance of which he is at the commencement of this Act in receipt, and no more."

He proposed to leave out the words "in receipt," where it first occurred, and insert "entitled to receive in addition to the salary of his office," to leave out the word "of" after "allowance," and in the last part of the clause to leave out "in receipt," and insert "so entitled to receive." So that whatever amount of superannuation allowances Sir Richard Bromley was entitled to in addition to the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital he would still be entitled to receive after the vacation of that office. He begged to move the first of these Amendments.

Amendment *agreed to,* as were also the two other Amendments which were subsequently proposed by the hon. Gentleman.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he rose to move that the clause be struck out, and submitted that the Treasury had deprived Sir Richard Bromley—a most able and distinguished public servant—of £233 a year, to which he had an absolute legal claim. He asked the opinion of the Attorney General as to whether this was not so. He could not help remarking upon the extraordinary and unexpected course which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Childers) had just taken. He was sorry to see that the Government had inserted in a Bill placed before that House a clause which he could describe in no other terms than as a shameful clause. The Bill was introduced many weeks ago, and the omission of this clause was moved by the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Morton Peto). The Government resisted the Motion, and had persistently adhered to the clause. The clause in the Bill, as it originally stood, had for its object to debar a meritorious and distinguished public servant from seeking a remedy in the Courts of Law. The Government must have introduced this clause under an erroneous impression, for the House would not have tolerated such treatment of any subject of Her Majesty. However, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Childers) had seen right to change his course, and this change must be attributed to a conversation which he (Sir John Pakington) had with the Attorney General on Thursday last. He felt so clearly the nature and mischief of the clause that he drew the attention of the Attorney General to it, and asked him if he were conversant with the facts of the case, as he could not believe the House would tolerate such an injustice as was sought to be effected by this clause. After this conversation the clause which had stood for weeks in the unjust shape was changed so as to leave Sir Richard Bromley open to sue the Government in a Court of Justice. It was evident that the Attorney General saw the unreasonableness of the original clause. But the House had a right to be informed of the nature of Sir Richard Bromley's case. A Minute of the Treasury was passed in 1854 by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time when Sir Richard Bromley was appointed to the office of Accountant General of the Navy, in which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer recognized the services of Sir Richard Bromley during the Irish famine, and mentioned eleven instances in which that gentleman had performed essential service to the country, apart from his official duties, and gratuitously. The Minute went on to say that those services ought to establish his claim to a special reward, and ought to be taken into consideration when the amount of his retiring allowance came to be settled. He (Sir John Pakington) in 1858 found Sir Richard Bromley as Accountant General of the Navy, and about this time his health gave way, and it became so impaired that it was necessary to give him a long leave of absence. On that occasion a Minute was drawn up at the Admiralty in which he (Sir John Pakington) thought it due to Sir Richard Bromley to express his sense of the manner in which this able officer had discharged his duties, and that such a series of special services established a claim to special acknowledgment and reward and the highest superannuation allowance consistent with the existing regulations. Sir Richard Bromley was then allowed a long leave of absence, and his health was restored; he returned to his duties and continued to act for two or three years as Accountant General until his health again broke down from the multifarious duties which for a long series of years he had performed. In 1862 he asked the Duke of Somerset to increase his salary by £500 a year for additional duties placed upon him, and the Duke of Somerset replied that he wished him to go to Greenwich Hospital with a view to reform it, and that this would be his reward. In October, 1862, Sir Richard Bromley expressed to the Duke of Somerset that if it was his Grace's pleasure to appoint him a Civil Commissioner of the Hospital he should be happy to accept it, as he could hold it with his pension. In December, 1862, Mr. Whitbread, the Lord of the Admiralty, by the direction of the Duke of Somerset, again asked Sir Richard Bromley if he would go to Greenwich Hospital, and Sir Richard Bromley, on the 9th December, replied that he was willing, as he felt the work of his present office too harrassing to go on with after thirty-three years of service, and he could hold the Commissionership, with his pension, as others had done. In this he alluded to Lord Auckland and Sir Thomas Thompson, both of whom held the office with an untouched pension. In February, 1863, Captain Drummond and Lord Clarence Paget spoke to him on the subject, and on the 19th of March, Captain Ryder, the Private Secretary of the Duke of Somerset, wrote that he was directed to inform him that it was the pleasure of the Queen to approve of his being appointed to a Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital. Thus this office was offered to Sir Richard Bromley without conditions, and was accepted by him on the principle that he was entitled to hold his full pension. In April, 1863, Sir Richard Bromley wrote to the Secretary of the Admiralty resigning his office of Accountant General, applying for his pension to be granted him, and the Board of Admiralty passed a Minute recommending his pension to be fixed at the largest amount consistent with the law, which would be £1,300 a year. At the moment the Board of Admiralty recommended the highest amount of pension to Sir Richard Bromley he was in possession of his appointment at Greenwich Hospital. In their Minute of July, 1863, the Treasury said that under the Superannuation Act he was entitled to

£715 a year, but added that with a view to mark the sense entertained of Sir Richard Bromley's eminent and special services, and with the understanding that the Superannuation Act applied to his appointment in Greenwich Hospital, his allowance would be fixed at £1,000 per annum. Now, was Greenwich Hospital under the Superannuation Act? He (Sir John Pakington) did not think any Member of the Treasury Bench would say it was. The Government had unjustly and illegally endeavoured to override the Act of Parliament by introducing a condition of this kind, and to set up their own decision in opposition to the Superannuation Act. Professing to give Sir Richard Bromley £1,000 a year they had practically reduced his pension to £481, although he had a positive legal right under the Superannuation Act to £715 a year. He admitted that Sir Richard Bromley had no absolute right to the £1,000 promised him, and that to give him that sum would be an act of grace and favour on the part of the Treasury for which he would be grateful; but if he applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* the Treasury might be compelled to pay him the £715 a year, to which he was entitled under the Superannuation Act. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Childers) had consented to alter the clause so as no longer to preclude Sir Richard Bromley from asserting his right in a court of law; and he therefore appealed to the hon. Gentleman and to the House, whether it was not better that a claim of that kind, on the part of a distinguished public servant, should be met by the generosity and good feeling of the Government rather than that he should be driven to establish it against them in a Court of Justice. The clause applied to Sir Richard Bromley and to him only, and its sole effect had been to keep him out of a court of law. The words having that effect being, however, now abandoned, he asked what was the object of retaining the clause at all? He hoped the House would support him in his endeavour to have the clause struck out altogether, as a record against an attempt to deprive a distinguished officer of his rights. He moved the rejection of the clause.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he was at a loss to understand what object the right hon. Gentleman (Sir John Pakington) could have in objecting to a clause which he himself acknowledged afforded sufficient security for perfect justice being done to the gentleman whose name he had mentioned. It was not at any time the intention of the Government to interfere with any legal right which Sir Richard Bromley might be able to establish, and he did not believe that the original words of the clause would have been construed in a court as having that effect; but the moment they found that those words were thought to be in the least degree ambiguous they had endeavoured to amend them, so as to obviate the possibility of any such construction being put upon them, and to leave Sir Richard Bromley with all his legal rights entirely untouched. If that gentleman was able to satisfy the Government that he had the rights which he claimed without having recourse to a Court of Law, they would admit them; but if he was unable to satisfy them on that point, or to establish his claim in a Court of Law, surely the House would not go out of its way to give him that to which, upon that hypothesis, he was not legally entitled. The whole circumstances of the arrangement had not, he believed, been fully stated by the right hon. Gentleman. As far as his (the Attorney General's) information went, he believed that the arrangement for giving the appointment of Greenwich Hospital, and the pension, were parts of the same transaction. With regard to the question of law, having done his best to make himself master of it, he must say he thought that question was by no means so clear as it appeared to be to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Putting aside all questions of form, the question was whether the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital was an office in a Public Department within the meaning of the 20th section of the Superannuation Act. He had looked into that Act, but did not feel competent, without further consideration, to pronounce a decided opinion. If he looked at the list of Public Departments mentioned in the Act, he agreed that Greenwich Hospital was not one of those Public Departments, but it would be erroneous to decide upon the meaning of the words "public department" with reference to that clause only. No doubt Greenwich Hospital was not mentioned in the Act. No doubt the 14th section said that superannuation allowances were to extend to all civil offices and Departments of State set forth and enumerated in the schedule. But it did not stop there, for the same section gave power to the Lords of the Treasury to add to the list of Departments any others which then existed or should thereafter exist, and to place them under the provisions of the Act. Therefore, those enumerated in the Act did not exhaust the list of Public Departments. The question required examination whether Greenwich Hospital had or had not been treated as a Public Department. He was not prepared to say decidedly whether the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital had been treated as a public office. Seeing that the payment on account of the office was not voted by Parliament, nor did it come out of the Consolidated Fund, he thought those were, at first sight, arguments in favour of the view of the right hon. Gentleman. But he did not think that these arguments were of necessity conclusive, and the House would be ill-advised if it were to come to a vote upon an assumption of the question when the rights of Sir Richard Bromley had been strictly preserved to him by the clause in the Bill.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he was sure that the Government had acted under some misapprehension in this matter. He agreed that they ought not there to discuss a question of law; but he was also sure that when the hon. and learned gentleman (the Attorney General) had considered the terms of the statute of William IV. he would at once see that the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital was not within that Act. He would state shortly the facts. When Sir Richard Bromley, after thirty-two years' service, was desirous of retiring from the office of Accountant General of the Navy, his services had been recorded in successive Minutes of the Admiralty and of the Treasury, and it was said that those services entitled him to the highest pension consistent with existing regulations whenever he should retire. He had performed many gratuitous services, and the Government had expressed a desire to reward him for them, and it was a question whether he should receive a considerable increase of salary; but instead of this course being acted on, he, at the suggestion of the Duke of Somerset, accepted the office of Commissioner of Greenwich Hospital. Sir Richard Bromley had accepted the office of Commissioner of Greenwich Hospital on the understanding that he was to receive £1,000 a year, or £285 more than he was legally entitled to as retiring Accountant General. On 1st April, 1863, when Sir Richard Bromley resigned the office of Accountant General, he was entitled by law to a permanent retiring pension of £715 a year; and, upon accepting the office of Commissioner, he became legally entitled to £818 a year more, making his total income £1,533 a year. This was undisputed. But the Government had offered him £1,000 a year, or £285 more than the £715 to which he was legally entitled. Such were his legal rights on the 1st April, 1863, when he resigned his office. He applied for his pension, and he hoped in addition to receive something from the grace and favour of the Government for his meritorious services. He applied, and then the Treasury made this Minute. It recited his services, and the records of those services by the Treasury and the Admiralty, and then it recited that his permanent retiring allowance had been fixed at the highest amount. It went on—

> "My Lords therefore feel that the case is eminently one to be dealt with under the 9th section of the Superannuation Act of 1859."

The question he wished to ask Her Majesty's Government was, whether or not they intended to give Sir Richard Bromley £285 per annum, according to the recommendation of the Admiralty, beyond what he was strictly entitled to? Unfortunately, the Government had annexed the condition that the office was to be deemed to be within the Act of William IV., and by so doing, instead of giving Sir Richard Bromley the £285 per annum, for his extraordinary services, in addition to the £1,533 to which he was legally entitled, they had actually despoiled him of £235 per annum, out of the £1,533 per annum to which he was legally entitled. As the office was not within the Act of William IV., let the Government grant him a pension of £1,000 a year according to the statute, without more, and Sir Richard Bromley would receive the reward they professed to give him of £285 a year in addition to that to which he was legally entitled. If the office was within the Act, which cannot be seriously contended, the Minute was superfluous, and unnecessary.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he would explain why the clause had been inserted. It was the principle of the Superannuation Act that an officer receiving superannuation and appointed to another office, should not draw more of his superannuation allowance than would make up the salary of his new office to his former salary. But it was necessary to provide that, on being a second time removed from office, the annuity should stand in the same position as the second salary. If the clause was not inserted in the Bill, Sir Richard Bromley would, apparently, be able to claim to have no deduction made from his superannuation, whatever deduction was legally made from it while he held office. Thus he would, receive more for doing nothing, than while in office; a state of things which he felt the House would be indisposed to tolerate. Sir Richard Bromley was at present in receipt of a total sum of £1,600, and that income, so long as he is Auditor of Prize Accounts, he would still retain. With respect to the supposed hardship of the Treasury decision, he was obliged to explain to the House that at Sir Richard Bromley's request, the Duke of Somerset had already made up to him all he could claim. On the 12th of June, 1863, and subsequently to his acceptance of the office of Commissioner of Greenwich Hospital, Sir Richard Bromley wrote to the Duke of Somerset stating that he understood that a pension had been granted to him of £1,000 a year, calculated upon his salary of £1,300 a year. Sir Richard Bromley complained of the condition which was insisted on—that his salary as Commissioner of the Hospital and his pension together should not exceed the £1,300 a year which he had previously enjoyed as Accountant General of the Navy. He then requested to be allowed to retain his £300 as Auditor of Prize Accounts, an office which he regarded as having been conferred upon him personally, and not in his capacity of Accountant General. In accordance with this request he was allowed to retain the office of Auditor, which till then had been combined with that of Accountant General, and it enabled him to receive the £1,600 which he had before received. He (Mr. Childers) asked whether that proposal of Sir Richard Bromley—in consequence of the decision of the Treasury—and the acceptance of the proposal by the Duke of Somerset to allow him to receive £1,600 per annum up to this time, as provided in the Bill, did not do justice to that officer.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to say a few words, as the justice of Her Majesty's Government had been called into question. With regard to the liberality of the Government, he might state that if Sir Richard Bromley had retired from the office of Accountant General of the Navy on his superannuation allowance, and had afterwards been appointed to the Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital and superannuated or pensioned on the abolition of that office, he would be in a better position than if the Minute which had been referred to had not been made. The Minute intended to make a liberal arrangement for Sir Richard Bromley, but it was rather an injury to him than a favour. He hoped, after what had fallen from the Attorney General and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Childers), the case would be fairly considered by the Government, and that the House would be spared the necessity of dividing on the clause, on the understanding that Sir Richard Bromley's legal rights, whatever they were, would be preserved to him.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he hoped after what had fallen from the Attorney General, who had dealt very fairly with the case, that the Government would concede to Sir Richard Bromley whatever was due to him in point of law.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was not prepared to enter into any condition.

Question put, "That Clause 13, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 124; Noes 67: Majority 57.

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT (1856) AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 219.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Robert Peel.*)

MR. BAGWELL said, he opposed the Motion. If it were really necessary at this late period of the Session to pass a measure on the subject it ought only to be a continuance Bill for a single year. Let a Bill for the registration of arms be separately introduced; and let them no longer be compelled, as they had been at the Tipperary assizes, to convict lads simply for having percussion caps or bullets in their pocket.

MR. BRADY said, he opposed this Bill, as he had constantly done for years, believing that it degraded the people of Ireland. Originally this had been called a Crime and Outrage Bill. The necessity for it had long passed away, and the only effect of it was to irritate the people and to perpetuate the oppression of which they justly complained. There were trials going on under it in Ireland that would disgrace any part of the world.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he opposed the Bill, on the ground that it was an instance of exceptional legislation for which no necessity whatever had been shown.

MR. BLAKE said, he thought it highly satisfactory that the Bill had been opposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Clonmel (Mr. Bagwell), a resident proprietor in Tipperary, who would have been the first to support the Bill had there been any real necessity for it. When the Bill was brought in the Chief Secretary admitted the peaceable state of the country, and therefore the right hon. Baronet ought at least to make the concession suggested by the hon. Member for Clonmel.

MR. ESMONDE said, he had voted for the Bill on a former evening, but hoped now the right hon. Baronet would be content to pass it for one year.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, that the Bill was proposed to be passed for the smallest possible period, that was to the end of the next Session. As to the general state of the country, everybody would admit that it was most peaceable. For instance, in 1853, there were a thousand prisoners in gaol in Clonmel, but in the present year there were only sixty-three. That showed conclusively the great improvement which had taken place in the county of Tipperary. This Bill was proposed to be reserved only by way of precaution. There were certain baronies in Mayo, Galway, and Monaghan, and after communicating with the magistrates the Lord Lieutenant in Council would be prepared to take away the proclamations from those baronies. He trusted the House would consent to pass the Bill.

MR. LANIGAN said, he wished to inquire whether the right hon. Baronet would consent to withdraw the proclamation from the county of Tipperary, which he had stated to be so peaceable?

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, the magistrates of Tipperary had made no representation on the subject.

MR. MAGUIRE said, the right hon. Baronet had given a most admirable description of the state of Ireland, and it was well that the fact should go forth to the English people, because it was said that capital was kept away as there was no security in Ireland. The peaceable state of Ireland, however, was no justification for a coercion Bill. The existence of former Governments depended on the introduction of such a Bill, but now the Chief Secretary rose and proposed a coercion Bill as easily as he performed the very homely personal function described the other night by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley). Persons engaged in an illegal marching at Ballincollig had some time since been brought before Mr. Justice Keogh, and the common law of the country was found sufficient for their punishment. It would be wise policy of the Government to show their increased confidence in the people of Ireland by not again passing this measure, as there was no necessity for it. If the Government could show no necessity for the Bill, hon. Gentlemen were justified in opposing it. As the right hon. Baronet had not consented to limit the operation of the Bill he should move that it be read a second time on that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Maguire.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. TORRENS said, that the hon. Member (Mr. Maguire) in the earlier part of the Session had made a statement that there was great disaffection in Ireland, and that being so, it was a sufficient justification of the Bill.

MR. HENLEY said, that he had waited with the greatest anxiety to hear what grounds the Chief Secretary for Ireland would allege in defence of a Bill which he could not help denominating a very exceptional and unconstitutional one, and the only reason which he had heard him assign for adopting this measure was that it had been in force before, and, therefore, it might as well be continued. He had paid some attention to the judicial statistics of Ireland, and they certainly afforded no justification for passing such a Bill as this. When a district was proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant, any man who had in his possession any part of a gun or an ounce of powder was liable to twelve months' imprisonment; any body who met another body upon the road with such a thing might take it from him, and any policeman might search any man, woman, or child, turn them up, and see whether they had anything of the kind about them. The Government could, by means of these proclamations, put a perpetual blister upon any part of Ireland in the shape of an extra police force to be paid by the district. He was surprised to hear the Chief Secretary say the other night that the noble Lord the Member for the county of Mayo had told him that the gentlemen of that county thought that a proclamation now in force there might be removed, and that, therefore, he should write to the Lord Lieutenant on the following day to ask him to recall it.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that what he had said was, that he had communicated with the noble Lord, who said that he would make inquiries of the magistrates, and let him know whether they thought the proclamation might be withdrawn.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the words of the right hon. Baronet, as he understood them, and as they were reported in *The Times*, which generally pretty accurately reported the debates in that House, were that he—

> "Had been in communication with his noble Friend the Member for the county of Mayo upon the subject of the proclamation, which had been in force since 1861, and he intended to inform the Lord Lieutenant that in the opinion of the gentlemen of that county there was no reason why it should not be revoked."

If this was the way that proclamations were recalled, perhaps they were sometimes issued under parallel circumstances. During the five years preceding 1851 the number of criminals indicted in Ireland was 130,000; during the five years ending 1863 the numbers had dwindled down to about 29,000. This was a most remarkable change. The people were flying from the land as if it was a pesthouse, and was that to be wondered at when such laws as this were in force? In Ireland there was a policeman to every 420 people, while in England the proportion was only one to every 880 or 890. Surely with such a force of police and the powers given to them by the ordinary laws the Government could preserve the peace of the country. As he had heard no reason for the passing of this Bill, he should vote against the second reading.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) had not correctly apprehended the argument of his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary What his right hon. Friend (Sir Robert Peel) said was that it was the intention of the Lord Lieutenant, in communication with the lieutenants and magistrates of counties, to see how many of the proclamations now in force could be safely withdrawn; but that was a very different thing from allowing them all to lapse by the expiration of the Act of Parliament which this Bill was intended to renew. Such neglect might be attended with the most disastrous consequences. All that was now asked was that time might be allowed for the further consideration of the state of Ireland with a view to see whether it would be necessary to retain that Act. The Government hoped that it would not, but that must depend upon the state of the country. In the meantime the continuance was only sought for a year, and till the end of the then next Session of Parliament, the shortest period for which it was the practice to take annual continuance Bills.

Mr. O'REILLY said, that under this Bill the Act would remain in force during the whole of 1866 and until the end of the Session of 1867—that was, till August, 1867. The proposal which would satisfy everyone was that it should be renewed only till the end of 1866.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 76; Noes 29: Majority 47.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS (RETIRING PENSIONS) BILL—[Bill 133.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE said, he had formerly drawn attention to the memorial of Sir Francis Head, asking that his claims should be considered; but it now appeared that the Government were unwilling to make any special provision in his favour. Under these circumstances he had received the following letter from Sir Francis, asking that his case should not be pressed:—

"Croydon, June 6, 1865.

"My dear Sir William Jolliffe,—In cheerful submission to the adverse decision of Her Majesty's Government with respect to my services in Canada, which has just been privately communicated to me, I lose no time in expressing to you my earnest desire that you will kindly abstain from uttering in the House of Commons another word in my behalf. For, as my case is now hopeless, you will, I am sure, concur with me that it would ill become me to allow—if I can possibly prevent it—any Member of Parliament uselessly to interrupt, for a single moment, the unanimity with which the Colonial Governors Pension Bill will, I hope, without any further reference to my services, now pass into a law.

"Believe me to remain
"Yours faithfully and gratefully,
"F. B. HEAD."

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Definition of "Metropolis" and "Company").

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he wished to ask what rule had been adopted with regard to these pensions, and upon what principle the claims of Sir Francis Head had been rejected.

MR. CARDWELL said, this Bill was based upon length of services, and the period of Sir Francis Head's service was extremely short. Last year he had given a pledge that the subject should be fully considered; so that, if they were unable to admit the claims of Sir Francis Head, the right hon. Gentleman opposite should have the opportunity of taking what course he felt inclined to take upon this Bill. Since then the case had been fully considered, and the Government thought it impossible to insert a clause providing for that particular case.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, that Sir Francis Head's letter did that distinguished public servant great honour. He expressed his deep regret at the decision come to by the Government.

MR. ADDERLEY moved the insertion of words limiting the grant of these pensions out of the British Treasury to cases in which the salaries were a charge on the British Treasury. It was an act of absolute folly to charge the Imperial Revenue with pensions in cases where the salaries were payable by the colonies. The Bill was a continuation of the old vicious system by which the interests of the Crown and of the colonies were regarded as being separate.

MR. CARDWELL said, the objections taken to the Bill were the same as those which were made on the second reading, and they had therefore already been disposed of by the House.

MR. HENLEY said, he wished to remind the House that it was already nearly a quarter to two o'clock, and that they had to meet again at twelve o'clock.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, it would only take twenty minutes to go through the Bill.

Amendment *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUGAR DUTIES AND DRAWBACKS BILL.

[BILL 198.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Third Reading read and *discharged.*

Bill *re-committed; considered* in Committee.

MR. CAVE said, that this Bill was founded upon a convention which was to last ten years. That was much too long a time. There might be mistakes *ab initio* as that with regard to paper and rag duties in the French Treaty; or an altered state of affairs might arise, as was the case with the oyster fisheries affected by the French Fishery Convention, and so much mischief might ensue. Could not the Chancellor of the Exchequer arrange these conventions for shorter periods?

Amendments *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

AZEEM JAH (SIGNATURES TO PETITIONS).

The Sergeant at Arms attending this House informed the House, that George Morris Mitchell had been this day apprehended, and was now in Newgate.

A Petition of George Morris Mitchell, a State Prisoner in Her Majesty's Gaol of Newgate, expressing his deep contrition and regret if he has offended against the dignity of the House, and praying for his release from custody, *brought up,* and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be *printed.* [App. 2.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 20, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading*— Greenwich Hospital * (179); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * (180); Malt Duty * (181); Harbours Transfer * (182); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2)* (183); Pier and Harbour Order Confirmation (No. 3) * (184); Trusts Administration (Scotland) * (185); Ayr Burghs Election * (186); Crown Suits, &c. * (187); Kingstown Harbour * (188); Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * (189).

Second Reading—Admiralty Acts Repeal* (165); Admiralty Powers, &c. * (166); Dockyard Ports Regulation * (167); Prisons (155); Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment * (61).

Committee—Railway Debentures, &c. Registry * (99); Locomotives on Roads * (164); Land Debentures (Ireland) (113); Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment * (106); Trespass (Scotland) * (146); Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment * (125); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * (157); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) * (154); Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment * (136); Procurators (Scotland) * (153); Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland) * (128); Colonial Laws Validity * (158); Colonial Marriages Validity * (159); Defence Act (1860) Amendment * (152).

Report—General Post Office (Additional Site) * (124); Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment (151); Trespass (Scotland)* (146); Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment * (125); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation * (157); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) * (154); Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland) * (128); Colonial Laws Validity* (158); Colonial Marriages Validity * (159); Defence Act (1860) Amendment * (152).

Third Reading — Union Chargeability (171), and *passed.*

PUBLIC HOUSE CLOSING ACT (1864) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 151.)

REPORT.

Amendment *reported* (according to Order).

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE, having presented a number of petitions for the restoration of Clause 5, which had been struck out of the Bill, said, that it was undoubtedly a great grievance on market gardeners, cattle drovers, and others who were legitimately employed between the hours of one and four o'clock, a.m., that they could not procure refreshment during that time. The habits of society in all large towns required that hotels should be kept open until a late hour in the night for the purpose of balls, concerts, and other entertainments; and it was monstrous and absurd that the middle classes should be precluded from amusing themselves, because the authorities, in whom the power lay, refused to grant licences for the hotels to be kept open after one o'clock in the morning. The power vested in the police was often exercised in an arbitrary manner, as in the case of the town of Liverpool, where it was publicly announced that no licences whatever would be granted except to St. George's Hall and the Town Hall, which were the property of the corporation. The law was of an anomalous character, and the power of granting licences to certain persons so as to give them an advantage over their rivals required to be exercised with great delicacy. There was a very strong feeling upon the subject, and he hoped that Government, upon further consideration, would allow the Bill to be restored by inserting the clause which the House of Commons had agreed to after much discussion.

Moved to re-insert Clause 5. — (*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

EARL GRANVILLE said, the object of the Act of last year was to prevent disorder, immorality, and drunkenness by the suppression of what were known as "night houses," and had been very effective in that respect, and he (Earl Granville) was very unwilling to assent to any proposal calculated to diminish the good that had been obtained. But it was found that the Act occasioned great inconvenience in certain cases, and this fault the Bill now before the House proposed to remedy, by giving the police authorities power to grant licences to certain houses to remain open during certain specified hours for certain particular purposes. The object of the clause which their Lordships had struck out was to vest this discretionary power in the magistrates instead of in the police authorities. No complaint, however, had been made of the manner in which the police authorities had acted in the matter, and as they were intimately acquainted with the character and requirements of their neighbourhoods, it would be better to leave the power of granting the licences in their hands.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, that the object of the Act of last Session was to remedy a crying abuse existing in certain parts of London. The Act was intended to apply to London alone; but power was given to different counties in England to adopt the provisions of the Act if they thought fit. A great many of the counties did accept its provisions, and upon the whole the law had done away with much abuse, and had met with approval. There were, however, many occasions, especially in country towns, where country balls, concerts, and other meetings were held, where it was desirable that the opportunity of obtaining refreshments within the forbidden hours was very desirable; and these cases had been met by giving power to the police authorities to grant "occasional licences." It was, however, found that, in the case of certain trades and certain localities, the public-houses could not be closed during the specified hours without considerable inconvenience being felt, and it had been held that the power of the police authorities extended only to grant licences for a particular and specific occasion, and not to cases where continuous exception was necessary. Accordingly, the present Bill was introduced giving power to suspend the operation of the Act in certain cases. The question in dispute was, whether that discretionary power should be vested in the police authorities or in the magistrates at petty sessions. With all respect for that very useful body the police, he thought that the more they were confined to their executive functions, and the less they were intrusted with judicial discretion, the better it would be for the community. The proper tribunal to exercise the discretionary power conferred by the Act was that consisting of the magistrates in petty sessions. He had himself seen a notice issued by the chief constable of a town declaring that he would not grant any licences whatever—under any circumstances whatever, in a certain district—thus rendering the law a dead letter. This was probably an extreme case; but it was easy to conceive that in large towns the granting such licences would throw great additional labour upon the chief constable, and that therefore he might be very unwilling to grant the licences, or to make the necessary inquiries even in cases where there was very good ground for the exemption. Then, again, the hardship upon the hotel-keepers was great in cases where the chief constable did not reside in the town in which they lived. For instance, the hotel-keepers in the town of Chichester had to go to Petworth, where the chief constable of the district resided, a distance of fourteen miles, in order to obtain permission for a party of ladies and gentlemen to remain in their houses after a certain hour. If the power to grant the licence were vested in the magistrates, the hotel-keepers need never stir out of the town to obtain a temporary exemption from the provisions of the Act. As the House of Commons had expressed a strong opinion upon the subject by their vote given in opposition to the Government, their Lordships could not do better than restore the clause which the House of Commons inserted, and which the House of Lords, without fully discussing the matter, threw out.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that if the noble Marquess would consent to the omission of the metropolis from the clause he would not object to its being restored to the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, he would assent to that arrangement.

THE EARL OF DERBY understood that the arrangement was that the clause should be restored to the Bill; but that another clause should be brought up exempting the metropolis from its operation.

EARL GRANVILLE assented.

Motion *agreed to:* Clause re-inserted.

Bill to be read 3^a on *Thursday* next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 192.)

PRISONS BILL—(No. 155)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL GRANVILLE, in moving the second reading, said, that the object of the Bill was twofold. It was partly to consolidate the existing law in relation to prisons, which in some particulars was contradictory, and beyond that it proposed to amend the present law. The amendments which it proposed to introduce into the law of prisons were based chiefly on the recommendations of a Committee of their Lordships' House, which, under the presidency of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon), had considered this subject very fully:—there were, however, points where it had been found difficult or impossible to give practical effect to those recommendations. The chief object was to secure greater uniformity in the management and discipline of prisons, and greater uniformity also in the carrying out of the punishment of hard labour. The Bill was one of great detail, and he should only be wearying their Lordships if he went through all the clauses. He should be ready to consider any suggestions which might be made by any noble Lord, and to go fully into the various provisions of the Bill, if it were necessary, in Committee.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Lord President.*)

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he regarded this as one of the most important Bills which had been submitted to their Lordships consideration during the present Session; and as he had had the honour of being Chairman of the Committee of their Lordships which considered the question some two or three years ago, they would probably pardon him if he made a few remarks on the Bill. He entirely agreed in the important proposals which this Bill contained, which in the main carried out very fully the recommendations which had been made by the Committee. He certainly should have preferred the Bill in the shape in which it had originally left the Home Office, and without the alterations which had been made in the Select Committee of the other House. At the same time, these alterations did not affect the principle of the Bill, and could be dealt with in Committee. As far as he understood the Bill it did not profess to lay down a fixed code of regulations which must be followed undeviatingly in every prison in the country; but it laid down a sort of skeleton code, leaving it to the local authorities to clothe that skeleton with all the accessories necessary in each case. That he thought the wisest and most prudent course, for he thought it of great importance to preserve the executive control of the prisons in the hands of the local authorities. The history of prison discipline, like that of many other things, was the history of progress, not towards one particular point—but in a zig-zag sort of direction. At the commencement of the century we had a system of treatment of prisoners which was marked by extreme severity. Some thirty or forty years afterwards a better state of things arose; and the reform gradually went on, until at last we got to a system which, instead of being marked by extreme severity, was marked by undue leniency, and under which, in fact, felons in prison enjoyed greater comforts than many people out of it. The point at which we ought to aim was a plan of prison discipline somewhere between the two extremes, which would secure effective punishment combined with every reasonable provision for the improvement of the prisoner. When this Bill was first brought forward by the Home Secretary the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was founded on a system which he (the Earl of Carnarvon), concurrently with other local magistrates, had established in Hampshire. Unless for short periods of punishment and during the earlier stages of longer sentences indulgences were avoided there would be a danger of falling into the old state of things, which had incurred the reproach of making a prison a place of indulgence, instead of a place of punishment. For short periods of imprisonment a system of hard unproductive labour should be enforced; for without it he thought the whole system of deterring punishments would break down; and even during the course of longer sentences he did not think that all traces of that rigorous system should entirely disappear; during the earlier stages of long sentences severe penal labour should be enforced, and prisoners should be enabled to pass step by step, and degree by degree, from the lower to the upper penal class. It was quite true that such a plan would involve a system of classification, and that, again, would also involve a system of marks; but, although it was possible to devise an elaborate system of marks, it was also possible to adopt a plain and simple system. He had personal experience of the admirable results which had followed the adoption of such a system, and in proof he would mention two facts, which were better than any arguments. When he adopted the system in the prison with which he was connected he found there was an immediate and noticeable decrease in the number of punishments for prison offences, and he also found that of those punishments which were still inflicted they were mostly inflicted upon men who were undergoing their first month's imprisonment, during which period by the rules of the prison no marks were granted. He maintained, therefore, that a system of classes and marks was indispensable to give effect to a good system of prison discipline. But, whatever plan they might adopt, it would be of no use unless the whole system was based upon the great principle of accepting no promises or professions of good conduct, but of accepting as the only test of good disposition the actual work done by the man, and of profitable work done in his leisure hours over and above that required from him by the prison rules. It might be objected to a system of classification that it would grant too great indulgences. If that were the case it would be a fatal objection to the system; but he did not think that a series of small indulgencies and remissions would have any but a beneficial effect. The principle of remission had the advantage of bringing discipline in county prisons into an analogy with the system pursued in convict prisons. It would be, of course, impossible in county and borough gaols to grant remissions in the duration of sentences, but it was possible to make remissions in the character of the punishment. Having taken much interest in this question, he had ventured to trouble their Lordships with these few remarks on the general question. With respect to the Bill before the House, he must point out one or two matters which he thought required alteration. As the Bill was originally introduced into the House of Commons the hard labour clause was drawn up in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee, that the punishment should be definite; but, in the Bill as it stood now, there were alterations in that clause which materially changed its character. He would prefer to see the clause restored to its original state; but if that were not done he should in Committee move an Amendment with a view to make the clause more intelligible. There was also in the Bill a clause providing for the abolition of solitary confinement, which clause was not in the original Bill, and was quite at variance with the recommendation of the Select Committee. He might also observe that the Select Committee recommended that a certain number of gaols which were open to grave objection as to the manner in which they had been conducted should be scheduled for abolition. A certain number of gaols had been scheduled accordingly; but he was sorry to find that some prisons which were shown to have been conducted in a very improper manner had been omitted, and he should like to know the reasons for such omissions. For instance, there was a prison at Poole, and another at Falmouth where the average number of prisoners was seven, and whenever the gaoler went out he locked the prisoners in a courtyard, leaving his wife in charge, armed with a dinner bell, to alarm the neighbours in case of an attempt at escape. Such prisons ought not to have been left out of the schedule.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

LAND DEBENTURES (IRELAND) BILL.

(NO. 113.) MOTION FOR COMMITTEE.

THE EARL OF CORK, in rising to move that the Land Debentures (Ireland) Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House, said, he was induced to take that course because he believed that the measure was a very beneficial one. The main object of the Bill was to enable landowners in Ireland to raise money cheaply and speedily without in any way complicating their title; while it would also furnish capitalists with an easy and safe source of investment. Every precaution against fraud or accident, arising from the mutilation or loss of debentures, would be taken by the Bill, while under its provisions a landowner would not only be able to improve his property, but to pay off his encumbrances at his own convenience and in small sums, by taking up the debentures, and thus gradually diminishing the charge upon his estate. The subject was one which had attracted much attention—not only in Ireland, but also in this country. As he believed that the measure would tend to increase the value of land in Ireland, he trusted that their Lordships would agree to his Motion.

Moved, That the Bill be *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

LORD ST. LEONARDS opposed the Motion. The Select Committee had determined that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with upon principle, and not with reference to any particular provisions. The object of the measure was to enable proprietors of Irish estates to make a sham mortgage, to get it registered, and then to issue debentures upon their property to the amount of that sham mortgage. He thought that the Select Committee had acted wisely in deciding against proceeding with the Bill, and he hoped their Lordships would come to a similar decision. They ought not to do anything to tempt Irish proprietors to encumber their estates. Ireland had been ruined in consequence of proprietors encumbering their estates to an extent which compelled them to sell at a considerable loss, and he hoped their

Lordships would not, by passing this Bill, hold out additional inducements to them to effect mortgages.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, that the decision of the Committee was arrived at by the votes of five English Peers against three Irish ones, and he thought that his noble Friend was perfectly justified in appealing against it to the whole House. This measure had been very carefully considered by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and had received the sanction of that House. There was no greater want in Ireland than the application of capital to the cultivation of the soil, and any measure which would promote that object would be a boon to the landed proprietors of the country. He hoped that their Lordships would agree to the Motion.

On Question? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 51; Not-Contents 14: Majority 37:—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

House in Committee accordingly:—Amendments made; The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next, and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 193).

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Somerset, D.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Amherst, E.
Belmore, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Devon, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Mayo, E.
Minto, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Spencer, E.

Hawarden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*) [*Teller.*]

Abinger, L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*) [*Teller.*]
Camoys, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Clarina, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne.*)
Denman, L.
De Tabley, L.
Foley, L.
Hastings, L.
Hatherton, L.
Leigh, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Vivian, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Richmond, D.

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]

Hardwicke, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.

De Vesci, V.
Lifford, V.

Chelmsford, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Polwarth, L.
Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Saint Leonards, L.
Wynford, L.

UNION CHARGEABILITY BILL—(No. 171.)

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3^a (according to Order) with the Amendments.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he gave his hearty support to the Bill because he thought that, on the whole, there was in it a great preponderance of good, as leaving the working men absolutely free to go where they pleased. At the same time, he must confess that he approved the Bill only as a step towards a still larger measure, although he was afraid a long time might elapse before any further advance was made in the matter. He desired to see the area of charge extended as far as possible, even to the whole country. It had been objected that by a national rate the payment would be made out of the Consolidated Fund, and that it would follow that the Poor Law should be administered by a central body entirely. What he understood, however, by a uniform rate was such a system as had been proposed by the Earl of Malmesbury some years ago, by which, though the charge was uniform through the country, it should be still levied and administered locally, as at present. He should like to see that system established, with the total abolition of the law of settlement and removal, and he trusted that the noble Earl who was not now trammelled by official duties, would turn his attention to framing a Bill by which that object could be carried into effect. The abolition of the law of removal without, however, the abolition of the law of settlement, was proposed many years ago by Mr. Coode. Approving, however, as he did, the principle of the Bill, he thought, it might have been framed with a little more consideration for existing interests than it had been. In some parishes, which might be called close parishes, without any faults on the part of the owners, as only a small population was needed, the rates would be doubled and trebled. Even if the whole loss were thrown on the landlord in the first instance, it would be a hardship; but, in many cases, it would be wholly thrown on the tenants for a time.

The Duke of RICHMOND said, that having been absent on the debate on the second reading he wished to express his great satisfaction at the success of the measure. He could not agree with the noble Lord who had just spoken (Lord Lyttelton) with respect to the desirability of extending the area of rating to the extent which he pointed out. He thought it open to great objection. A national rating must lead to the intervention of Government authority, and would do away with the excellent system under which were got together the landlord, the farmer, the magistrate, and the clergyman to work for the benefit of the poor of the district with which they were connected. He believed that this measure would confer the greatest benefit on the labouring classes, and would lead to an improvement in the administration of the Poor Law itself. The able-bodied labourer would not be fettered as he was at present, but would take his labour to the larger markets, and would thus command a greater price for the labour which he would bring to the farmer. It had been urged by a noble Friend of his that though the good and active labourer would be benefited, the inferior labourer would be in a worse position if the Bill passed. Though this argument had something plausible in it, a little examination of it would show the fallacy. The business of a union was generally conducted by a few guardians who attended regularly. He thought that if the Bill passed affairs would be managed as they were at present, and a few regular attendants of the guardians would attend to the business of the union. In his own union, out of fifty-nine guardians, there attended on the average only eleven, and these practically carried on the affairs of the union. The same parties would attend under the new system, and would soon discover that every shilling improperly spent would be out of their own pockets, though distributed over the whole union. In the same way the farmer would discover that if a weak labourer were thrown upon the rates, instead of getting employment, it must tend to increase his own taxes, and that it would be for his interest to employ him in his own parish. No doubt it would take time to get the measure into working order; but he (the Duke of Richmond) had no doubt that before long the affairs of the union would be worked just as if it was one large parish. The present law had been in favour of the system now happily exploded of close and open parishes; but though the pulling down of cottages was now done away with there was still a strong inducement not to build new cottages. He was astonished it should be said there was no evidence to show that cottages had been pulled down and that others had not been built in their places. If noble Lords would take the trouble to refer to Mr. Buller's Report of 1847, the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons last year, and a Report dated so far back, he thought, as 1830, they would find that if there was any information on any one subject more than another it was information to show that cottages had been pulled down and that others had not been built to replace them. For some time past the tendency of all our legislation with respect to the poor had been in the direction of this Bill, and it would be idle for their Lordships to try to stop it. One Inspector stated that more than half the expenditure of a union was now charged on the common fund. That being so, this Bill would only affect the less than a moiety which was charged to the parishes. Believing, therefore, that the Bill only carried out a principle which had been already recognized and acted upon by Parliament, that it would be beneficial to the poor, and that it would effect an improvement in the administration of the Poor Law, he was happy to give it his support.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at half past Seven
o'clock, till Thursday next,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 20, 1865.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report* — Open Spaces (Metropolis); Expiring Laws.

Supply — *considered in Committee* — *Resolutions* [June 19] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee.*

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Excise Acts; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries); Bank Notes Issue (Scotland); Compound Spirits Warehousing.

Second Reading—Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* [209]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * [225]; Turnpike Acts Continuance * [227]; Colonial Docks Loans [226].
Committee—Fire Brigade (Metropolis) [153]; Harwich Harbour (*re-comm.*)* [214]; Carriers Act Amendment * [224]; Roads and Bridges (Scotland)(*re-comm.*)[165]; Falmouth Borough* [200]; Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment [219]; Ulster Canal Transfer * [211]; War Department Tramway (Devon) * [*Lords*] [204].
Report—Fire Brigade (Metropolis) [153]; Harwich Harbour * (*re-comm.*) [214]; Carriers Act Amendment * [224]; Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [165]; Falmouth Borough * [200]; Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment [219]; Ulster Canal Transfer * [211]; War Department Tramway (Devon) *[*Lords*] [204].
Considered as amended—Inland Revenue * [207]; National Gallery (Dublin)* [203]; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment [220].
Third Reading—Greenwich Hospital * [212]; Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [215]; Malt Duty* [160]; Harbours Transfer* [216]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2)* [222]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3)* [223]; Trusts Administration (Scotland) * [158]; Record of Title (Ireland) * [*Lords*] [217]; Wick and Ayr Burghs Election* [165].
Withdrawn—Turnpike Tolls Abolition [128]; Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment [37].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

COUNTY COURTS EQUITABLE JURISDICTION (JUDGES' SALARIES).

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolution *moved,*

That provision be made for the payment out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland of the sum of Three Hundred Pounds per annum to each of the Judges of the County Courts, in addition to their present salary.—(*Mr. Peel.*)

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH objected to the proposed increase, and said, it had been found by a Return that the Judges whose salary had been raised to £1,500 had not been the most deserving so far as their duties were concerned. There were nineteen Judges who sat in their Courts only from 150 to 200 days in the year, and thirty-five who sat only from 100 to 150, and one who actually did not sit 100 days. If this increase in the salary should be made, those holding other legal appointments of a similar character would be making application to be placed on the same footing. He feared also that the measure would be detrimental to the legal profession itself.

MR. LONGFIELD regretted that the old principle of fees had not been retained. The duties of the Judges varied considerably—some Judges would be getting £300 a year for hearing ten extra cases, while others would have perhaps 300 additional cases. The annual sum of £18,000 would be required to increase the salaries £300 each.

MR. PEEL said, it was anticipated that the new fees arising out of the equity jurisdiction would fully cover the additional charge on the Consolidated Fund. Paying the Judges by fees was most objectionable. In the first instance, the County Court Judges were paid by fees; but it was soon found necessary to substitute salaries. It was proposed by this Bill to have no new salaries exceeding £1,500 a year; but only to augment the existing salaries when the Judges had imposed on them the new duty of judging in equity.

MR. AYRTON hoped it would be clearly understood that if hereafter bankruptcy jurisdiction should be given to the County Court Judges, this would not involve another increase of salary.

MR. HENLEY thought the principle of paying a Judge by salary and not by fees a sound one. The County Court Judges generally (there were exceptions in which it was more) received £1,200 a year, and it was proposed to increase their salaries by one-fourth. Had they at present one-fourth of their time idle? If not, how would the public receive a benefit for the increased pay? At present our gaols were lumbered up by County Court prisoners, sent under what was called penal imprisonment. When the new equitable jurisdiction was given to the County Court Judges, ought there not to be some provision against the enlargement of this penal imprisonment? He trusted that the Secretary of State for the Home Department would consider the subject.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the conclusion drawn by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) from the Bill—namely, that the County Court Judges were not employed more than three-fourths of their time, was a good way from the truth. A large amount of their time was employed in travelling from place to place, and in opening and closing their Courts. It was now proposed to make a considerable addition to their duty, which, however, he believed they might perfectly well undertake. As to the inquiry whether this proposal implied that there was to be a fresh increase of salary whenever new duties were added, he felt bound to say that in his opinion the scale of pay in the Civil Service was liberal, and in the legal profession more than liberal—it was large, very large. This proposal must be taken with reference to that scale in general, and not as an isolated scheme, and he believed it was equitable.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN drew attention to the fact that the County Courts of England cost the enormous sum of £240,000, and Scotland cost £100,000, while those of Ireland, whose Judges had a more extended jurisdiction, only cost £15,000, and part of that was recouped by a stamp duty. A small stamp duty on every case ought to be charged on the English business.

Mr. HENLEY was inclined to think what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer had strengthened rather than weakened what he had suggested. Deducting the time of travelling and of opening and closing Courts, which would remain the same, it would be an increase of one-third instead of one-fourth.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, the salaries would not be too large if they were to get the best men.

Motion *agreed to.*

Resolved, That provision be made for the payment out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland of the sum of Three Hundred Pounds per annum to each of the Judges of the County Courts, in addition to their present salary.

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

FIRE BRIGADE (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 153.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 5 were *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Purchase of Plant of existing Fire Offices).

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR moved the adoption of the following proviso:—

> "Provided that the means of extinguishing fires afforded by the said 'London Fire Engine Establishment' shall not be diminished within the respective districts within which such means are at present applicable."

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, if the Fire Insurance Companies were not satisfied they had better have kept the matter in their own hands. It would be most unfair to the Metropolitan Board to hand over to it the duty of carrying out this Bill and then hamper them by a proviso like this.

Mr. T. G. BARING said, he could not agree to the proviso, and assured the hon. Baronet that according to the plans proposed to be carried out the protection to every part of London would not only not be diminished, but it would be increased.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Powers of Fire Brigade).

Mr. AYRTON moved to add to it that—

> "No Water Company shall be liable to any penalty or claim by reason of any interruption of the supply of water occasioned only by compliance with the provisions of this section."

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Contributions by Insurance Offices).

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS moved—

> "That the rate which the Companies shall pay instead of £35 for every million of business, shall be £87 10*s.* per million."

This Bill inflicted some hardship on the metropolis. The Fire Brigade, as now constituted, cost £25,000 a year, and the effect of the Bill would be to give a bonus of £15,000 a year to the Companies, which would have to be borne by the ratepayers. The cost of the proposed plan was £50,000 a year; and of that the Offices would pay £25,000 a year, the Government would pay £10,000, and the object of his Amendment was to provide for the remaining £15,000 somewhat differently to the way the Bill provided for it. Mr. Drummond, Chairman of the Fire Brigade Committee, and one of the leading directors of the Sun Office, had stated that the offices did not want to escape paying their fair share—that gentleman completely and positively disavowed any wish to saddle the public with £25,000 a year, although he said "the public of London had no more business to have their fires put out for nothing than Liverpool, Manchester, or other towns." If the clause were agreed to it would divide the additional £25,000 a little more equitably between the Companies and the public.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 11, to leave out the words "thirty-five," in order to insert the words "eighty-seven," —(*Mr. Harvey Lewis*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'thirty-five' stand part of the Clause."

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR said, the Insurance Companies were under no obligation to provide a Fire Brigade, and if they were saddled with a large sum they might either withdraw altogether or charge an increased sum on their premiums. Within a radius of six miles from Charing Cross it was computed that there was property to the value of not less than £900,000,000, and not more than a third of that was insured. Insurance Companies could not be expected to provide Fire Brigades for those who did not insure.

MR. AYRTON said, it was apparent that, whatever scheme was devised, the inhabitants of the metropolis would have to pay whatever sum was levied upon the Insurance Companies. He contended that the sum contributed by the Insurance Companies should be charged upon the premium, instead of on the amount of property insured. The premium was the measure of the risk against fire, and therefore the measure of the duty which the Fire Brigade was called upon to perform. A person who occupied an ordinary house should not be called upon to pay as much as the owner of a warehouse where the risk of fire was large. In the levying of a halfpenny rate this class of property would escape paying its fair proportion. He would, therefore, suggest that the words as proposed by the hon. Member (Mr. Harvey Lewis) should be left out, and then the House should consider what other words should be inserted in their stead, in order to maintain the principle to which he had referred.

LORD FERMOY, whilst admitting that the Bill was founded upon sound principles and would place the Insurance Companies in a better position than they at present held, said the objection which they, as representatives of the metropolitan ratepayers, had to the Bill was that in the compromise come to with the Insurance Companies the interests of the ratepayers were about to be sacrificed. The Companies would be certain to benefit by the change, and they should not shrink from paying as large an amount as before. He should support the Amendment proposed by his hon. Colleague (Mr. Harvey Lewis), and he trusted that the Government would deal fairly between the ratepayers and the Insurance Companies.

MR. T. G. BARING said, that if the offices chose to give up the brigade, the legal liability would rest on the parishes. There was no doubt a great deal to be said against raising the money necessary for maintaining the Fire Brigades by levying a rate; but, at the same time, by levying a contribution on the offices they were enabled to reach property which would be protected, but which would not pay anything to the rates. He hoped that the lowering of the duty would have the effect of reducing the amount of property uninsured, and that would diminish the difficulty of raising the contribution; because, of course, if the whole of the property of the metropolis was insured nothing would be fairer than to raise the necessary funds by a tax on the offices. As to the Amendment itself, he must object to it, because the present scheme was a compromise which he should be sorry to disturb.

Question put, "That the words 'thirty-five' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 61; Noes 16: Majority 45.

MR. AYRTON moved an Amendment to make the contribution to the Fire Brigade proportional to the amount of premium rather than to the amount of insurance.

MR. T. G. BARING reiterated his views that the contribution should be according to the amount insured, and not according to the premium.

Amendment *negatived*.

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR suggested that the period during which the Insurance Companies should contribute towards the expenses of the brigade according to their present rate, instead of in the manner provided by the Act, should be extended from one to three years.

MR. AYRTON thought the clause should be omitted from the Bill altogether.

MR. T. G. BARING agreed to extend the period to two years, and moved the insertion of an Amendment at the end of the clause.

Clause amended accordingly.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause to add the words "Provided that any Insurance Company which at the time of the passing of this Act contributes to the expenses of the said Fire Engine Establishment may, in respect of all payments to be made by it in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, but not afterwards, contribute after the yearly rate of thirty-five pounds in one million pounds of the business in respect of which it contributes to the said Fire Engine Establishment for the present year, according to a Return which has been furnished to the Chairman of the said Metropolitan Board, instead of in the manner in this Act provided."—(*Mr. Baring.*)

Question put, "That the proposed Amendment, as amended, be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 68; Noes 11: Majority 57.

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 12 to 15, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Contributions by Government towards expenses of Brigade).

Mr. BLACKBURN moved the omission of the words, "ten thousand pounds," in order to add—

"The amount of rate of $\frac{1}{2}d.$ in the pound in the full and fair annual value of all property belonging to the Crown in the metropolis, which would, if rateable, be charged to the relief of the poor."

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Expenses of Act not specially provided for).

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS moved to insert after the word "place," in line 5, the words—

"Such full and fair annual value to be computed to the last valuation for the time being acted upon in assessing the county rate."

Mr. AYRTON thought the words of the Amendment would create great inconvenience if they differed from the provisions of the Metropolitan Local Management Act.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. CLAY, with the view of relieving the Water Companies from the payment of rates on their pipes, those Companies having been in that respect very badly treated, moved to add at the end of line 5,

"Provided, that the proportion of any such payment by the overseer of any parish which shall be attributable to rates paid by any Water Company in respect of their pipes or works, may be deducted by such Water Company out of the next payment of rates demanded by such overseer, and shall be allowed by him accordingly."

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS objected to the Amendment on the ground that it would give rise to great litigation.

Mr. T. G. BARING also dissented from the Amendment.

Mr. CLAY denied that any litigation would necessarily arise in consequence of the addition of the words he had proposed, and said that the reason why he had asked the House to make such a concession was that the Water Companies gave water gratuitously for extinguishing fires.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Mr. AYRTON proposed a new clause (Maintenance of floating steam fire-engines on the River Thames by the Board), one provision of which was that the Conservators of the River Thames should pay £3,000 for the purpose out of the funds in their hands.

Mr. T. G. BARING said, he could not agree to the clause, the Thames Conservators having no surplus.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. AYRTON proposed to add a clause (Persons to whom assistance has been given to contribute towards the maintenance of the Fire Brigade.)

Mr. T. G. BARING opposed the clause.

Clause *negatived.*

Preamble *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Thursday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 230.]

ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL.

COMMITTEE.—[BILL 165.]

Bill *considered* in Committee [Progress 19th June].

Amendments made.

Lord ELCHO, in moving that the Chairman report Progress, said, he did so in order that he might have an opportunity of making a statement as to the portion of the measure, and the motives by which he had been actuated in bringing it forward. There was, however, small need for explanation since a paper which he held in his hand, explaining the reasons for introducing the Bill and the arguments in its support, had been scattered broadcast over Scotland, and had been sent to every official person and every one who might be supposed to be interested in the subject. He had brought it forward at the instance of a large number of people in Scotland who were anxious that there should be an improvement in the system of maintaining roads in that country. Various measures for that purpose had been laid before Parliament, and it had been frequently debated in that House.

The result was that a Royal Commission was appointed which had recommended that all tolls should be abolished, and that the turnpike roads should be maintained for the future by an assessment. In consequence, tolls had been abolished in various districts of Scotland by means of Private Bills; but he (Lord Elcho) and those with whom he acted, finding that the feeling in favour of the abolition of tolls was so general, and that so many counties were applying to Parliament for special Road Bills, came to the opinion that this was a good opportunity for bringing in a general Bill which would make it necessary for counties to make their special applications. A Bill was drawn up by a Committee appointed for the purpose, and was sent to us to be introduced before Parliament, but as its object was confined to the one point of abolishing tolls, it was felt that there was little chance of its obtaining the assent of that House. Great pains were taken to draw up a series of Amendments, which it was thought would make the Bill more acceptable to the House, and the delay thus occasioned was the reason why the Bill now came on at so late a period of the Session. The Bill as it came before the House was simply a permissive one; for it had been found, from the nature of the various applications for Private Bills, that the circumstances of the different counties were so varied that it was essential that the measure should be made elastic so as to be adapted to the requirements of the various districts. With regard to the general principles of the Bill, he might describe them as being three in number. One provided for a better method of establishing the claims upon statute labour roads; another was for the consolidation of tolls, so as to maintain roads at a cheaper rate; but the third and chief point was the proposal to maintain roads by assessment instead of tolls, as they were maintained in Ireland. He could not conceive a greater mistake on the part of the railway companies than that they should ask to be relieved from the just assessment of their property for the support of roads—for it must be to their advantage that they should have good roads to take travellers to and from the railways. But another opponent of the Bill was the hon. Baronet the Member for Ayr (Sir James Fergusson), who had given notice to move that the county of Ayr be excluded from the Bill. They could not have anticipated the opposition of the hon. Baronet, for he was one of the Commission which recommended the abolition of tolls. Neither did they expect to have any opposition from the burghs, as they had supposed they at least would like their communication with their counties to be unfettered by tolls. The burghs, however, took a different view. The burgh which seemed to be most violent in opposition was Perth. It seemed to think that it represented all Scotland, and his hon. Friend the Member for that burgh (Mr. Kinnaird) showed himself a worthy representative of that spirit. Up to the present moment, it had been found impossible to satisfy the burgh of Perth; but all the other towns—with the exception, of course, of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other very large places—were satisfied with the changes which have been made in the Bill. What they objected to was that any portion of the assessment should be placed on the burgh. But it was manifest that the fairest plan was that proposed by the Bill—to assess the various parishes according to the mileage by the assessor appointed for that purpose. The burghs which were the chief opponents of the Bill had all, except Perth, withdrawn their opposition; but the special ground on which the hon. Member (Mr. Kinnaird) in his notice on the paper claimed to exempt Perth, was not a little curious. He proposed that Perth should be exempt, because the Harbour Commissioners have incurred a heavy debt for the improvement of the river communication on the Tay. That argument—if argument it could be called—was equally applicable to every town which had spent money on public improvements. There was another clause to be proposed by the hon. Member who objected to pay any portion of any debt now owing by the roads. But what did the Bill propose? Simply that the occupiers should pay the interest, and the landlords the capital. At present, it was well known that the occupiers paid the interest; and the Bill, therefore, left them exactly where it found them. The promoters had steadily kept in view the principle that the Bill ought not to shift any burdens or alter liabilities, but simply to unfetter the traveller's legs, so that he might travel more easily. However, it was manifest that the Bill could not pass this Session, and, therefore, all he proposed was that any enterprizing Member of the new Parliament introducing a Bill on the subject should have the advantage of seeing this Bill amended as proposed. He therefore proposed to go into Committee *pro formâ*, that the Amendments might be printed, and not to proceed further. Whether any very enthusiastic Gentleman took up this subject in the new Parliament or not depended very much as to what took place in Scotland; but whether his Bill passed or not, tolls would soon be extinguished. Such being his opinion, it might be asked why trouble himself about any Bill at all? The reason he wished to see the Bill passed was that so many counties would apply for private authority, and he wished to save them the expense of coming to Parliament for so many private Acts. Out of the thirty-three counties of Scotland, eleven were free of tolls; and of the remainder, some, he knew, were about to apply to Parliament. The spirit of Rebecca was not stifled. They all remembered how she startled us some years ago with her white nightcap and long white shift, and her weapons, the crowbar and hatchet; but when they saw her again she would be clothed in a lawyer's gown and wig, and be armed with a blue bag and a long bill. In the course of a very few years these tolls would be swept away, but it would be better for Scotland if it were done by means of some such measure as he was now proposing to withdraw. The noble Lord moved that the Chairman do report Progress.

Moved, That the Chairman do report Progress.

MR. BLACKBURN said, any Scotch Member who took up this subject in the new Parliament would find it rather a hopeless one. There could be, however, no objection to the Bill being put into a more perfect shape, with a view to its consideration hereafter. The noble Lord was mistaken in thinking that he (Mr. Blackburn) opposed his Bill in the interests of the railway companies. They had nothing to ask. He, however, objected to permissive Bills altogether. The noble Lord, however, he might be permitted to say, was eminently entitled to the thanks of the country for the pains and trouble he had bestowed on the measure.

MR. STIRLING said, the noble Lord had not quite done justice to the county which he (Mr. Stirling) had the honour to represent. He was aware that when the Bill came before Parliament the county of Perth did not view it in a very favourable light; but after it had been amended, they were disposed to look upon it with a much more approving eye. The noble Lord might, therefore, I think set down the county of Perth as favourable on the whole to his measure. He concurred with the hon. Member for Stirling (Mr. Blackburn) that the noble Lord deserved the highest praise for having taken up this subject, and the light he had thrown on it.

THE LORD ADVOCATE thought every one would admit the care and ability with which the noble Lord had discharged his self-imposed task, and he, for one, regretted his labours had not been crowned with the success they deserved. If the Scotch Members would take a larger grasp of the subject, and not allow difficulties such as would arise in all cases of this kind to be regarded as insurmountable, there would be no impossibility in passing this Bill even now.

COLONEL SYKES: The principle of the Bill was right; but there were private interests and associations which were opposed to any general measure on the subject. He believed a Bill to abolish tolls would be generally approved if their interests could be propitiated.

SIR JOHN OGILVY could not refrain from tendering his thanks to the noble Lord for the able and frank manner in which he had done his best to meet all objections.

Motion *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported;* to be *printed,* as amended [Bill 231]; *re-committed* for *Monday* next.

REVIEWS OF THE MILITIA.

QUESTION.

LORD BURGHLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether there would be any objection to make provision in the next Militia Estimates for Brigading Regiments for Review during the last week of the Annual Training?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he was not able to give a definite answer to the Question of his noble Friend, the matter being one that must be reserved for consideration when the next Estimates were being prepared. It was not simply a matter of expense. He was aware that reviews of the kind proposed would be very acceptable to a great many militia officers; but there were other very good officers who would not like to give up the time that would be necessary. The subject, however, should receive the attention of the War Office.

ARMY—RECRUITING.—QUESTION.

COLONEL NORTH asked the Under Secretary of State for War, If the Report of the Committee upon the Recruiting of the Army will be laid upon the table of the House?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the Report was one entirely of a Departmental character; and, therefore, he did not propose to lay it on the table of the House. It would not be expedient to state the recommendations of the Committee until they should have been considered by the Horse Guards and a decision come to respecting them.

ITALY — CAPTURE OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS BY BRIGANDS.—QUESTION.

MR. OWEN STANLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any communications have taken place between the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Italian Government with regard to the detention of an English gentleman by the Brigands? After the amusing and pathetic account which had appeared in Monday's paper his hon. Friend would probably thank him for putting the question.

MR. LAYARD said, the accounts which appeared in the papers last week were entirely fabulous, not containing one word of truth. With regard to Mr. Moens, he had unfortunately been carried off by brigands into the mountains, and Her Majesty's Government had been in constant communication with the Italian Government upon the matter. Both Governments were doing all they could, prudently, to obtain his release; but as the subject was one requiring delicate management his hon. Friend, of course, would not expect him to go into details of the actual steps taken. This morning intelligence had reached that the chief of these brigands had been captured. He was not aware whether Mr. Moens had been yet released, but he hoped that event would not be long deferred.

CHINA—FOREIGN VESSELS UNDER THE CHINESE FLAG.—QUESTION.

MR. LIDDELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any communications have passed between the Foreign Office and Her Majesty's Representative in China, relative to the permission said to have been given by the Chinese Government to its subjects to own Foreign Vessels and sail them under the Chinese Flag; and, whether, with a view of affording protection to the crews and cargoes of such vessels, Her Majesty's Government anticipate the necessity of any increase of our Naval Forces in Chinese waters, or whether the protection of its Flag will be left exclusively to the Chinese Government, and all risks attending such trade, coasting or otherwise, left to be borne by such Chinese owners?

MR. LAYARD said, there had been a report to the above effect in the public papers, but the Government had received no information on the subject either from the British Consul at Shanghai or from Her Majesty's Minister at Pekin.

MASTER MANUFACTURERS—RENTAL ON MACHINERY.—QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT CLIFTON asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been directed to the hardship inflicted upon working men by Master Manufacturers in their charge of rental upon machinery in reduction of their earnings, and in contravention of the principle of the Truck Act; and whether it was his intention to introduce a Bill for remedying that hardship?

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he had not received any representations on the subject, and consequently there was no present intention to legislate.

THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC — TREATMENT OF A BRITISH OFFICER.

QUESTION.

ADMIRAL WALCOTT asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give any information respecting the treatment to which Lieutenant Johnson, of the Royal Navy, has been subjected on the south-east coast of America? It appeared that one evening Lieutenant Johnson was on shore when his attention was attracted to two men, one of whom appeared to be murdering the other. He rushed forward and wrenched the pistol or knife from the assailant, who, having dealt him a blow, made his escape. After this, the police came up and seized Lieutenant Johnson, considering that he was the party who had murdered the other man. In spite of his protestations to the contrary they carried him off to prison, and ten hours elapsed before he was liberated.

Mr. LAYARD said, the facts of the case were not exactly as the gallant Admiral had stated them. The occurrence took place in the Argentine Republic, not at Rio. Lieutenant Johnson was returning home late one night when he heard screams issuing from a house. He endeavoured to enter by the front door, but found it locked. He went round to the back, and thus gained admission. He then saw two men in mortal conflict. He interfered and wrenched the pistol from one of the men, who then escaped. Some watchmen came in, and seeing a man dangerously wounded, they seized Lieutenant Johnson and severely beat him. They then carried him off to prison, where he was locked up for many hours, and only released when he explained who he was. Mr. Thornton, the British representative in that country, brought the subject under the consideration of the Argentine Republic, and an apology was made for what had been done, and the watchmen had been apprehended and would be tried for the offence of which they had been guilty. The representative of the Argentine Republic in this country had also expressed his regret to Earl Russell at the circumstance which had taken place.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

The O'DONOGHUE, in rising to move—

"That an Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system of University education in Ireland prevents a large number of Her Majesty's subjects from enjoying the advantages of a University education, and praying that such steps may be taken as will remedy this grievance,"

said, that he made his Motion with the greatest confidence, because he believed there never was a period when legislation was so little influenced by mere party and sectarian prejudice, and his experience had led him to the conclusion that there was a growing anxiety on the part of the Legislature, and also on the part of the great mass of the English people, to establish equal laws throughout the Empire, and place all Her Majesty's subjects on a footing of perfect equality, as the best means of preventing sectarian divisions and attaching all classes of the people to the Throne and Constitution. If he showed that the effect of the present system of University education in Ireland was to prevent a great number of Her Majesty's subjects from availing themselves of the advantages of University education, he should have proved the existence of a great grievance, and one which it would be the duty of the House to assist in redressing. It was the great boast of England that she furnished the brightest example of toleration, and that nowhere were the rights of conscience so scrupulously guarded. He therefore did not expect to be told that the Legislature was bound to give to members of the Established Church and to Presbyterians what it was bound to refuse to the Roman Catholics. He was confident it was the opinion of the House that all sects and classes were entitled to full and equal justice, and that all ought to participate in all the rights and privileges which it was possible for British subjects to enjoy. The Legislature could not confer exclusive privileges upon one class without producing discontent among others, and thus imperilling the peace and safety of the Empire. The members of the Establishment and the Presbyterians would not submit to be deprived of educational or any other advantages enjoyed by others; and he would say, on the part of his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects and co-religionists, that they refused to admit the exceptional treatment to which they had hitherto been exposed in regard to University education. Their position was one of grievous inferiority. The relative position of the three religious denominations had been described by Sir John Gray in a speech before the Dublin Corporation. He stated that while there was a University for 600,000 Protestants, and special arrangements for the Presbyterians, the Roman Catholics, numbering 4,500,000 of the population, had as Roman Catholics no recognized University and no educational institution of a high order of which, as Roman Catholics, they could avail themselves. The Roman Catholics had no wish to deprive their fellow-countrymen of any advantages they enjoyed—they only asked to be placed on a footing of equality with their fellow-subjects and co-religionists in England, in Canada, and Australia. He thought that the experience of the past ought to have convinced every reasonable man that the Roman Catholics entertained conscientious objections to the present system of University education in Ireland, and that these objections were insuperable. They had persistently refused to avail themselves of the present system, and this ought to be accepted as a proof that it had failed to satisfy their just claims and requirements. He took it for granted, of course, that no one would be foolish, impolitic, or wicked enough to tell the Catholics of Ireland, "You must overcome your scruples or do without University education." Every one was aware that Trinity College was, and always had been, essentially Protestant, and that no one was admitted either to the teaching or governing body who was not a member of the Established Church. Now, it was not likely that the character of Trinity College would be altered in order to meet the wants of the Catholics. Then, as all knew, educational experiments had been tried by the establishment of the Queen's Colleges; and among the peculiarities of their foundation were these two very remarkable incidents, as they were called—first that they were to be kept free even from the bare suspicion of having any pious or religious tendencies whatever; and, in the next place, that persons of any religious creed, or of none at all, might belong to the governing body. Now these extraordinary peculiarities, operating upon the minds of a people who had always invested the instructors of youth with certain indispensable characteristics and qualifications, had produced the miserable failure to which he would now call attention. He would first of all show the total number of students in each of the University Colleges in Ireland, including Trinity College, and then give the number of Catholics in each. In Belfast the total number of students was 405, of whom the Catholics were 22; in Cork the total number of students was 263, of Catholics 123; in Galway the total number was 169, the Catholics 78; and in Trinity College the number of students was about 1,000, of whom the Catholics were 45. The total number of students in the legally recognized Colleges in Ireland was 1,837, of whom the number of Catholics was only 268. Now, it could be shown that while the number of Catholics attending the recognized Universities was but 14 per cent of the whole, the number attending the intermediate schools for superior education, of which there were sixty-seven under the clergy, was fully equal to that of all the other denominations attending the same class of schools. According to the Census Returns of 1861 the total number of pupils in the intermediate schools was above 14,000, of whom more than 7,000 were Catholics. That fact must be taken as a proof that but for the conscientious objections to which he had referred the number of Catholics attending the Universities in Ireland would be infinitely more than at present, and at least equal to the number of youths of every other denomination receiving a University education. Coming now to the number of degrees in Arts granted in any year to the students of the three Queen's Colleges it would be found, first, that the two Colleges of Cork and Galway were merely schools as far as Arts were concerned, a considerable number of the students being under fifteen, while those above that age were almost entirely professional students; and, in the next place, that the Belfast College was the only one of the three which was, properly speaking, the college of a University. But Belfast was to all intents and purposes a denominational institution. It was almost entirely in the hands of the Presbyterians. Among the Professors there was not a single Roman Catholic, and all except one or two were Presbyterians; and out of 405 students attending it there were only twenty-two Catholic students. In Cork and Galway the number of students in Arts scarcely exceeded the number of scholarships. In 1864 the degrees in Arts granted were of LL.B. in Belfast one, in Cork and in Galway none; of A.M. in Belfast nine, in Cork one, and in Galway one; and of A.B. in Belfast forty-three, in Cork nine, in Galway seven. Of all the degrees in Arts granted in 1864 Belfast took 71, Cork 14, and Galway 13, and of all the professional degrees in the same year Belfast took 35, Cork 38, and Galway 26 per cent. In short, Belfast College was the only one which fulfilled its natural functions, while the other two were simply employed in providing the country with third-rate doctors. The amount of professional education given in the Queen's Colleges might be judged from the fact that 57 per cent in Cork were medical students, and of 263 matriculated only 62 were students in Arts. He had shown that the number of Catholics availing themselves of University education in Ireland as compared with that of the Protestants was very small, while the number of Catholics who attended the superior schools for intermediate education fully equalled the number of those who belonged to all other denominations attending schools of the same class. The inference was that the present University system of education in Ireland did not equal the requirements of the Catholics. He had also shown that the attendance of students at two of the three Colleges, not only in reference to Catholics but also to the whole community, was miserably small, and that two of those Colleges were nothing more than third-rate schools of medicine. It was quite clear that the number of Catholics attending the Queen's Colleges was never likely to increase to any considerable extent, because the intermediate schools, which would naturally supply the Colleges with students, were all under the control of the Catholic clergy, between whom and the Queen's Colleges there never could be any harmony or sympathy of any kind, since these institutions had been condemned by the Roman Catholic Church. What, then, was the remedy? It was a very simple one, and one which depended upon the Parliament and Government of this country to apply or not. Let a charter, conferring the power of granting degrees, as well as a charter of incorporation, be granted to the Catholic University which already existed in Dublin, though without a legally recognized existence. That institution had been founded by the Catholics, and was supported by them. A sum of £130,000 had already been contributed by the Catholics for its support. They did not come to the State and ask for a grant of public money. All they asked the State to give was those powers and that character without which a University could be of no practical benefit to the community. There was no doubt that their demand was founded upon justice and was supported by unanswerable precedents. The Members of the Establishment in Ireland had their chartered University; so had the Presbyterians. The Protestant Dissenters in England had theirs. The Catholics of Canada and Australia had their chartered Universities, their Colleges endowed by the State and governed by Catholic bishops. Then on what principle were the Roman Catholics of Ireland to be treated differently in this matter from all other subjects of the Crown? Why were they to be denied the right of free education? Why were they to be told, as they now practically were, "You must either avail yourselves of the University system which it is our pleasure to provide, or do without University education altogether?" The Catholics answered, and their answer was practically and forcibly given by Sir John Gray, "We are excluded for conscience sake; we are allowed, but cannot enter." He would not weary the House by calling attention to the examination papers of the Catholic University, but competent judges had pronounced them fully up to the recognized University standard. He was authorized to say, on the part of the heads of the Catholic University, that they courted the fullest publicity, and earnestly desired that all their arrangements should be submitted to the most searching scrutiny. Among the Professors were many whose names were well known to fame. He would only mention two or three. The Professor of Chymistry was Professor Sullivan, who had been appointed by the Government to a similar position in the Museum of Irish Industry, and in connection with the National Board of Education. The Professor of Medicine was Dr. Lyons, who had been selected by Her Majesty's Government to go to Lisbon upon an important mission. The Professor of Natural Philosophy was Mr. Hennessy, who had also been selected by the Government to assist the late Admiral FitzRoy in his scientific investigations. It was unnecessary to discuss the advantages afforded by a University education, both to individuals and to society, or to say how seriously the want of such an education was felt throughout every grade of Catholic society in Ireland. That want had been well illustrated in a petition addressed to that House, praying for a charter for the University. The petitioners said—

> "That as a University training is especially useful to all who propose to become professors or tutors in colleges and masters in grammar schools, more than one-half of all those who are engaged in the conduct of superior education in Ireland are accordingly unable to obtain that training, while Catholic students, who form the majority of those receiving superior education in Ireland, suffer the practical grievance that those professors, tutors, and masters are in great measure deprived, not only of the literary and scientific advantages which a University course of studies gives, but also of the social consideration which attaches to the possession of academic degrees."

It was a fact that very few of the Catholic nobility, gentry, lawyers, and medical men had had the advantage of going through a complete University course, and this fact was attributable solely to the want of a legally recognized Catholic University. He contended, then, that it was no exaggeration to say that the want of a Catholic University was a great grievance, and that it was trifling with the dearest interests of Catholics to tell them that this grievance must be perpetuated in order that a fanciful educational theory might be carried out. The Catholics had a conscientious objection to the present system, and, as was well known, had emphatically objected to it. On the part of the Catholics in Ireland, in the name of justice, as well as out of regard to the rights of conscience and the principle of according equal rights and privileges to all Her Majesty's subjects of different creeds, he asked the House to remove these educational disabilities from the Catholics, because they were not only objectionable to them, but also constituted a blot on the reputation of England, and were unworthy of that generous and enlightened spirit which governed her policy in the present day. He appealed to his Protestant Colleagues for support, and he did so with all the more confidence on account of their knowledge of the course which he and his co-religionists had taken in response to a similar appeal when addressed to them. He appealed to the Government, who already had given many proofs of the just and generous motives which governed their direction of public affairs, which he, for one, fully recognized and was deeply grateful for; and he asked them not to stop short in their career, but to persevere, intent only on doing justice to all by the establishment of equal rights and privileges for every class and denomination of Her Majesty's subjects. The hon. Member concluded by proposing, that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system of University Education in Ireland, prevent a large number of Her Majesty's Subjects from enjoying the advantages of University Education, and praying that such steps may be taken as will remove this grievance.

Mr. BAGWELL seconded the Motion, observing that the hon. Mover had, in a speech of singular moderation, nearly exhausted the whole subject. He thought that the hon. Member had, in the course of his speech, satisfactorily shown that the state of things in Ireland, with regard to University Education subsequent to the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, was by no means such as that House and the country, which paid so largely to these institutions, could desire. The late Sir Robert Peel—and he was not sure but that statesman's distinguished representative in that House was of the same opinion—said that Ireland was always the difficulty of every Administration. That was true—and the reason simply was because successive Administrations had always refused to give to the people of Ireland the privileges they were entitled to, or because, when they gave them, they had not given them with a liberal hand, but had dealt them out in a niggardly way, and generally on account of the exigencies of party for the sake of retaining their positions on the Treasury Bench. They had, however, invariably refused, and still continue to refuse, to grant to the people of Ireland that measure of justice which had been so long and earnestly called for. It was melancholy to look back to twenty years ago, when the Queen's Colleges were first instituted. Sir James Graham was the Minister who carried that measure through the House, and perhaps no statesman in England at the time was more capable of taking the conduct of a measure of that description; but he was warned over and over again by the leaders of the Irish people that educational colleges founded without a religious basis would fail. Sir Robert Inglis denominated the measure a gigantic scheme of godless education. There never was in that House a man more eloquent or more possessing the confidence of the Irish people than Mr. Sheil, who took an active part in the debates of 1845, and he declared that mixed education for secular purposes ought to be combined with separate religious instruction provided by the State. If that advice had been followed, in what a different position would things have been now! Mr. O'Connell, who was most trusted by the Irish people, and by the heads of the Church of which he was a member, stated that religion must be introduced into the system, or it would not be received by the Irish people, who were essentially a religious people, infidelity being unknown in Ireland. Mr. O'Connell called on the Government to act manfully, and make religion the basis of their proceeding, letting there be Presbyterianism for Presbyterians, Protestantism for Protestants, and Catholicism for Catholics. Lord John Russell, then in opposition, saw what the consequence of the Queen's Colleges, as proposed, would be, and he further suggested the appointment of chaplains, observing that Trinity College should be thrown open, or religious instruction should be provided for the Roman Catholics. That was the opinion of Lord John Russell, who was never looked on with favourable eyes by Catholics—but he believed that they were very much mistaken in their estimation of that noble Lord, who had always been a sincere promoter of civil and religious liberty. He entreated the Government, if they valued the good wishes of the Irish people and their own position and standing as a Ministry in that House, to look with favour upon the very moderate proposition now submitted to the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system of University Education in Ireland prevent a large number of Her Majesty's Subjects from enjoying the advantages of University Education, and praying that such steps may be taken as will remove this grievance."—(*The O'Donoghue.*)

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, the subject under discussion has been brought forward in a very temperate and able speech by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue), and has a very important bearing on the highest class of education in Ireland. It undoubtedly affects a large portion of our fellow-subjects in that country, and if it could be shown that they labour under any positive disadvantage with respect to University education, as compared with other classes of their fellow-subjects, they would be well entitled to have their case fairly and deliberately considered by this House. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee has confined his Motion and his speech to University education, but I understood him to refer not only to the course of education and instruction in literature and science pursued in the Universities, but also to the results of that course in qualifying for academical degrees. Now, a degree is not merely a nominal distinction. However valuable in itself, as a test and proof of a man having obtained a certain proficiency in literature and science—valuable as the standard of intellectual improvement is high — it confers a substantial advantage in professional pursuits in after life. In some professions a degree is an indispensable condition of practice. In others it confers advantages when a man enters upon his profession. Thus, in the case of the Bar, I believe that a person who has taken his M.A. degree may be called two years earlier than he otherwise could be. In Ireland, before the foundation of the Queen's University, a degree could only be obtained through the Dublin University—that is, Trinity College; and though Trinity College was liberal in its system of conferring degrees, so far as related to religious tests not requiring them with regard to lay degrees at all — yet, as the hon. Gentleman (the O'Donoghue) has stated, Trinity College is an establishment so essentially Protestant and so essentially connected with the Established Church, that we can hardly be surprised if comparatively few Roman Catholics availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by Trinity College of obtaining Academical degrees. It was under these circumstances that in 1845 the Government of Sir Robert Peel proposed the foundation of what are now known as the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. A new University, capable of conferring degrees, was not made an essential part of the scheme; but it was clearly in the contemplation of Sir Robert Peel and of the Government of that day that a University would follow, provided the Colleges took root in the country and promised to become permament. This was indicated in the speech made by Sir James Graham in moving for leave to introduce that Bill. The first step towards the foundation of the University was the establishment of those three Colleges, and the object—with which I entirely concurred at the time, and the importance of which I cannot underrate—was that of affording the best possible secular education for the youth of Ireland, irrespective of religious creed, no distinctive religious teaching being admitted into the system, but means being provided for voluntary religious instruction of students attending these Universities, by clergymen of the respective denominations to which those students belonged. I cannot but think that that object well deserved the attention of Parliament, and was dictated by a liberal and enlightened policy on the part of the Government which proposed it. The endeavour was to bring together young men of different creeds, hitherto separated by strong religious animosities, into friendly social intercourse and an honourable rivalry and emulation in the attainment of knowledge, and thus to fit them for the common performance, free from religious differences, of the duties devolving upon them as citizens of a common country. After these Colleges had been established for six years, the Government of the day, in 1854, carried into effect the intention announced by the Government of Sir Robert Peel — of founding a University by which degrees should be conferred independently altogether of Trinity College, Dublin. A charter was therefore granted to the Queen's University in 1854. That charter enabled the University to confer degrees upon all persons who came up to the standard of examination fixed by the governing body of the University, and who had passed through a course of instruction in any one of the Queen's Colleges. Some not very material modifications have since been made in the charter, but substantially the University is enabled to grant degrees, only to students who have passed through one or other of these Colleges. That is the present state of the law in Ireland. In order to obtain an academical degree a person must either have studied at Trinity College, Dublin, and become a candidate for a degree in the Dublin University, or must have studied at one or other of the Queen's Colleges and be a candidate for a degree at the hands of the Queen's University. That being the state of the law, the question is, whether any large portion of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland are debarred from obtaining a degree by any conscientious objection to the system of education pursued either at Trinity College or at the Queen's Colleges. And here, however, strong my own opinion may be in favour of mixed, or rather of united education—however much I may regret the decided opposition of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to that system—however much I may think Catholics mistaken in foregoing the advantages conferred upon them by that system—it is of no use to shut one's eyes to the fact that there are persons who entertain different opinions from those which I entertain, that these Colleges have not been received with the universal approval which it was hoped they might have met with, and that there are some Protestants, as well as many Catholics, who look upon the Colleges with feelings of aversion and distrust, with feelings amounting in many cases to a conscientious conviction that it is the duty of parents not to send their children to these Colleges, because they feel that there exists in them no sufficient guarantee for the inculcation of those religious principles which they look upon as the foundation of their future welfare, and therefore as the primary object of any scheme of education. I believe that that feeling is an exaggerated and a mistaken one, but I cannot deny its existence, and I am not inclined to impose my views on other people, to dispute their right to their own opinion, or deny that that is a conscientious objection which leads men to forego for their children the advantages offered by these institutions. The extent to which this feeling exists may give rise to a difference of opinion. For my part, I had rather not enter into any statistical statements in order to meet the case of the hon. Gentleman; but, according to the information with which I have been furnished, I think he has greatly exaggerated the failure of these Colleges, in which I believe there is a large number of students of different creeds, living together in social intercourse and religious harmony, and without any conflict of opinion, thus to that extent realizing the intentions of the Government which founded the Colleges. I should deeply regret anything which should interfere with the progress of these institutions, or deprive Ireland of the benefit which I believe they confer, and of the advantages of a good secular education which they hold out. I may here observe that there is an important distinction between the effect of the present state of the law and practice on the highest class of education, and on popular education in Ireland. In the national schools an excellent education is given to the children; but if there exists any conscientious objection on the part of parents to send their children to them, there are other schools to which they may send them; and when boys leave these and the national schools, they start in life on a footing of perfect equality. A boy educated in a school where there is denominational religious teaching is liable to no disadvantage, as compared with the boy educated at a national school, provided the secular instruction is equal in both. But that is not so with regard to University education. A student leaving a Roman Catholic College in Ireland cannot obtain a degree, and he is therefore at a great disadvantage as compared with the student leaving Trinity College or the Queen's University. To that extent I think there is a reasonable ground of complaint, and it is one the justice of which the Government admit. In England some years ago a degree could only be obtained through the medium of our two great Universities. The University of London was afterwards established with a charter, which comprised at first two Colleges, University and King's Colleges, founded on diametrically opposite principles; University College giving no direct religious instruction; while King's College was in close connection with the Established Church, and gave religious instruction in accordance with the doctrines of the Church. The University of London comprised both these Colleges, and gave degrees to students of each, but it has gone much beyond that. Schools and colleges in different parts of the country have been affiliated to it, and degrees have been conferred on students educated in them provided they come up to the standard of examination fixed by the governing body of the University. The University of London has gone even further than this for, under its present regulations, it receives candidates for its degrees from any school, or from students educated at home, provided they have attained that degree of knowledge which is equal to the standard fixed by the governing body of the University. In England, therefore, there is a system of perfect equality as regards degrees. It has been in operation some time, the Roman Catholics have largely availed themselves of the opportunity of taking degrees in the University of London, nor is the province of the University necessarily confined to England. I believe that one or two colleges in Ireland are affiliated with it. At all events, it is ready to receive candidates from Ireland as well as from other parts of the United Kingdom; and it is also willing, on payment of a moderate sum to cover expenses, to send examiners to Ireland in order to examine students there. Therefore that is done now indirectly which the hon. Gentleman asks us to enable to be done directly. Speaking on the part of the Government I see no reason why, the principle being already conceded, circuitous and expensive means should be taken for effecting indirectly what might be done directly or why those of our fellow-subjects in Ireland who cannot avail themselves of the advantages of University education and obtain a degree under the present system should not be free to obtain those advantages which their co-religionists possess in England. The only question is as to the mode in which that object is to be attained. In his previous notice of Motion the hon. Member for Tralee pointed to one mode — namely, the granting of a charter of incorporation, with the power of conferring degrees, to the Roman Catholic University of Ireland. He afterwards withdrew that notice and substituted his present Motion, and I am glad he did so, because to an Address to the Crown praying it to grant such a charter the Government could not have consented. Let me observe that that would not really meet to the full extent the inconvenience to which the hon. Member alludes, because there are Protestants as well as Roman Catholics who allege they have conscientious objections to the system of education in the Queen's Colleges. If a Roman Catholic University obtained a charter empowering it to grant degrees, that might be sufficient to remove the complaint of the Roman Catholics; but it would require to be supplemented by other measures before the inconvenience now existing in Ireland could be fully obviated. But there is also an objection to the multiplication of such bodies. By multiplying them you run the risk of having different standards of qualification for candidates, and the degrees lose much of their value. It is a different thing to have degrees conferred by individual Colleges and by a central University dealing impartially with all candidates and subjecting them to a uniform and searching examination to test their proficiency. Let me again refer to what was said by Sir James Graham in moving for leave to introduce the Bill for the establishment of the Queen's Colleges. Adverting to the future probability of a University growing up on the foundation of these Colleges, he observed—

> "I think that the advantages in favour of a central University decidedly preponderate. I think a central University affords a common arena in which from all these Colleges the youth of Ireland may assemble, and contend in honourable and honest rivalry for those exhibitions and prizes and those honours which are consequent upon, and result from, superior intellect and superior attainment. I think the national character of such an institution can only be exalted by such fair and honourable rivalry and competition; and it is not in the power of Universities, whatever their number or excellence, if scattered through the provinces, to confer equal advantages upon the country with those which would result from such a central institution, nor could you hope to attain from them that great moral effect and that beneficial influence in after life, which would be produced by the youth of one academical establishment meeting at a central point the youth of

another and rival establishment, and thus contending (without reference to creed or party distinction) for those honours and those distinctions which great intellect, combined with great merit and great attainments, are sure to bring."—[3 *Hansard*, lxxx. 359.]

I entirely agree in the opinion there expressed by Sir James Graham, and I think the House will not be disposed to sanction a scheme for multiplying the number of bodies conferring degrees. The Queen's Colleges were constituted a University to complete the scheme contemplated by Sir James Graham. There was a difficulty in interfering with the long-established system of Trinity College, Dublin, and therefore there are now two Universities in Ireland by which secular degrees are conferred. [Mr. WHITESIDE: Maynooth.] The right hon. Gentleman reminds me also of Maynooth, but that is a purely ecclesiastical institution. The hon. Member for Tralee said that members of the Established Church and the Presbyterians are both provided with distinct University education; but I am not aware of the existence of any distinct University for the Presbyterians. There is, indeed, the academical College at Belfast; but that is wholly of a clerical character. The hon. Gentleman is mistaken in supposing that there is any separate and distinct University for the Presbyterians, and I think it is undesirable that there should be such an institution. What is the mode, then, in which, upon the best consideration that can be given to the subject, the object to which the attention of the House has been called, and which we are desirous of promoting as far as we can, should be attained? Her Majesty's Government think it would best be effected by an enlargement of the powers of the Queen's University in Ireland, by amending its charter, so as to remove the restriction which now prevents it from granting degrees to any students except those who have passed through the course of instruction in one or other of the Queen's Colleges, and thus adopting a system analogous to that found to work satisfactorily in the University of London. The particular mode in which that should be carried out may require some consideration. It may be that it should be done by affiliated Colleges, or by accepting candidates from wherever they come, provided they reach the required standard fixed for attaining degrees. Admitting, therefore, that there is a just ground of complaint to a certain extent on the part of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and desiring to meet that complaint and place them on a perfect footing of equality with their fellow-subjects in England, we are prepared to consider the means by which the grievance to which the hon. Member has referred may be removed. I only hope that this course on the part of the Government may be met in a corresponding spirit by those for whom the benefit is intended, and that there will be absolute freedom allowed to the laity of all denominations to send their sons to whatever College holds out the greatest advantages, without undue favour or partiality to any. I trust that every ground of complaint as to obtaining University degrees being removed, there will be an earnest rivalry between these different institutions in Ireland in promoting the highest class of education, and I believe that those which confer the best education, which set up the highest standard of instruction, and which possess the ablest professors will in the long run receive most encouragement. I hope that the hon. Member will leave this matter in the hands of the Government, and if he does so I can only say it is our desire to deal with it in the spirit in which, on the part of the Government, I have met his Motion.

MR. WHITESIDE: Sir, the question now before us being one of very great importance, I think we ought clearly to understand what is the policy about to be inaugurated by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey). I concur with the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue), that there can be nothing more interesting to the Parliament of a free country than the education of those who may hereafter direct the councils and frame the laws of the land of their birth; and I also agree that education does not consist in the mere reading of books, but in that instruction which strengthens the faculties and liberalizes the mind of youth, and brings it into harmony with the institutions on which the welfare and greatness of the country depend. When I saw the hon. Member's original Notice of Motion I understood it. It was a direct Motion for granting a charter to a Roman Catholic seminary in Dublin. That was an intelligible proposition. But when I read his re-modelled Motion I came to the conclusion that it was a substitute for a direct Motion, and designed to enable a Minister of the Crown to make a vague speech, not defining anything precisely or certainly, but which might be useful on the present occasion. If I were to choose between the indefinite conception of the right hon. Gentleman and the direct proposal of the grant of a charter, I should prefer the charter, for the reasons which I shall shortly mention. But, before the House sanctions this new proposal, I venture respectfully to offer a few observations. The hon. Gentleman (the O'Donoghue) declares in his Motion that objections are entertained to the present system of University education in Ireland by a large number of Her Majesty's subjects. This must mean that these objections are entertained by a large number of Her Majesty's subjects who desire to enter, and are fit to enter, a University. A mistake may be made on this point. A book lately published entitled *An Analysis of the late Census of Ireland* shows that, whereas the majority in the class of peasants and small farmers is largely on the side of the Roman Catholics, the majority in the other classes is almost equally large on the side of the Protestants. In the profession of the law the Protestants are as three to one; in the other liberal professions they are in the same proportion; among the principal merchants and manufacturers it is also the same; and I find likewise that it is so with the skilled artizans in Belfast. Now, the great body of the peasantry are provided for by that system of national education from which it has been found hitherto to be impossible to persuade the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues to depart. It may be asked, then, why should we have another University? There are, as the House has heard, three Queen's Colleges so called, and the University to which they are attached. There is, besides, the College of Maynooth, and also the University which I have the honour to represent. If they will look back a little the House will see presently what I think is the real object of this Motion. I do not complain of it in the least—I only wish it to be clearly understood what it is the House is asked to do. In my understanding, the proposal involves a reversal of the whole policy on the subject of education advocated by Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and by every person who has sat on the Treasury Bench for the last twenty years. It may be right to reverse that policy, but that it will be a reversal nobody can doubt. When I had the honour of holding the office of Attorney General I remember Sir James Graham interrogating me very sharply as to whether I had it in contemplation to propose a charter of incorporation for a Roman Catholic College in Dublin. So sharp was the interrogatory that it almost seemed to insinuate I had entered into a plot to do something secretly against the institutions of the country or the prerogative of the Crown. I satisfied the right hon. Baronet that I had no intention of drawing up a charter. I had never heard of such a thing from Lord Derby, or anybody else—but the scrupulously conscientious view taken on this subject by the right hon. Baronet stimulated him to question me very closely as to whether I had such a dark design in contemplation. It will be well that the House should understand the nature of this question, and I will address myself to the Roman Catholic Members in particular. I wish to trace out for them how this question stands, and what will be the result of the inauguration of a new educational policy. When the University of Dublin, about seventy-five years ago, was opened to Nonconformists and Roman Catholics, a panegyric was pronounced upon the Liberal policy in the Irish Parliament by the late Mr. Grattan. Sir Fowell Buxton was educated in our University; and many gentlemen who could not at that time obtain a degree in this country did us the honour of paying us a visit. A question arose at that time in the Irish Parliament what should be done for the education of the Roman Catholic clergy; and a plan exactly similar to that which the right hon. Gentleman now contemplates was suggested—namely, the establishment of an institution in which members of that one religion only should be educated. The Roman Catholic laity of Dublin thereupon met and drew up a petition, which they sent to Mr. Grattan for presentation, and which seems by anticipation to answer everything that has been said to-night by the right hon. Gentleman. In it they declare, among other points, that in their opinion the greatest misfortune which could overtake the nation would be the separation of the youth of the country into two classes, one confined to one College and the other to a different one. Upon the presentation of that petition, and upon the arguments of such men as Mr. Grattan, the Parliament of Ireland refused to sanction the erection of a College in an exclusive spirit. Accordingly, until 1815, lay pupils were admissible at Maynooth. By degrees, however, it became more and more exclusive, until, as the House is aware, it is now confined entirely to the clergy of the Church of Rome. Sir Robert Peel, in my opinion, most correctly arguing that the State has the most lively interest in the education of so important a body, increased the grant to the institution; so that there, at any rate, I presume there can be no grievance whatever. For some years past further improvements have been made in Trinity College, and I do not believe that it would be for the benefit of the Roman Catholics themselves that they should be prevented from sending their sons to that University. The late Sir Robert Peel and the late Sir James Graham, holding the opinion that University education ought to be further extended in Ireland, founded the three Colleges of which the House has heard, and at that time there was in the House a number of Roman Catholic Gentlemen of great ability taking part in our debates. The hon. Member for Tralee has fallen into a misstatement when he supposes that any special advantages were given to Presbyterians or to Nonconformists over the Catholics in these Colleges. There was no distinction made by the Government or the law between the Colleges of Belfast, Cork, or Galway. [The O'DONOGHUE said, the Presbyterians in Belfast controlled in that College.] It is true that a distinction has grown up as to certain results in the College of Belfast, as compared with Galway and Cork; but it is because the sharp-witted people of the North saw in the College the very thing which they wanted, and they sent their sons to it, instead of, as they formerly did, to Scotland. The Presbyterians in Belfast, I believe, built contiguous to the Queen's College a large hall in which they provided religious education, and what it has been possible for them to do would be equally in the power of the Roman Catholics at Cork or Galway. The Presbyterians of the North supplemented the endowment of the State, and they have simply reaped a rich reward of their own common sense. I am aware that these Queen's Colleges are now condemned by the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, Archbishop Cullen; but I am in a condition to inform hon. Gentlemen of an interesting fact connected with them. The Government of Sir Robert Peel, before it determined the sites of those Colleges, sent out two gentlemen, Sir J. Larcom and a friend of my own, Mr. Major, one of Her Majesty's Counsel, upon whose authority I mention the circumstance, to travel over the country and ascertain the places in which the colleges ought properly to be placed. They arrived at Armagh, and two persons appeared before them. One was the late venerable and venerated Primate of Ireland, who told them they ought to found a College at Armagh, and he was satisfied he could make it a valuable and useful institution. He had scarcely gone when Dr. Croly, the Roman Catholic Primate, appeared, who also laboured to persuade them to found a College there, being persuaded that it would be most useful to Roman Catholics. I put before the House, and before Roman Catholic Gentlemen, this instance of a prelate of the same rank and authority, equally eminent for wisdom with Dr. Cullen, advocating the establishment of the very Colleges which are now authoritatively denounced. Dr. Croly was one of the bishops elected by the native clergy, and lived among the merchants of Belfast, by whom he was greatly liked and respected, and when a vacancy occurred he was appointed Roman Catholic Primate. I quote his opinion regarding the value of these institutions as one that may fairly be borne in mind at a time when we are asked to overthrow them, for it is idle to disguise that the object of this Motion is to overthrow these Colleges. For my own part, I would rather consent to the straightforward proposal of the hon. Gentleman than to the course indicated by the right hon. Baronet. If the charter be granted, unless we are greatly deceived by what we have read in the papers, the threat uttered by the Legate and Archbishop Cullen will be carried out—a threat—namely, of withholding the sacraments of the Church from all who send their pupils to any other than that College, which will then be under his supervision. An interesting and instructive passage occurs in the evidence given before the House of Lords by the late Dr. Doyle, to whom I have formerly referred. Having given his evidence in a patriotic spirit, one of the Committee asked him, "How shall we always be able to secure Prelates as patriotic as yourself?" The answer was, "You are perfectly safe there; the Papal interference you dread is a myth; we are elected by the parish priests, and consecrated by the native bishops, and what the Pope does is merely formal." But what happened? I am told that Dr. Cullen had not a single vote; and yet that eminent person, after a thirty-five years' residence in Rome, comes over and at once overthrows the liberal policy which had been adopted by such men as Dr. Croly, Archbishop Murray, and others. The House will remember that Royal Commissions were appointed for the reform of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, which effected very considerable alterations. I remember having a conversation with the late Mr. Fagan, when he was Member for Cork—and he was a man who always talked on these matters in a spirit calculated to have great weight with Protestants. He said to me that though the University of Dublin had done much, it had not done enough; that the Roman Catholics desired to be brought into a more intimate connection with the University, to be enabled to enjoy its honours and degrees more fully. It is a mistake to suppose that inferior degrees only are given to Roman Catholics. Though all graduates at Trinity College cannot obtain fellowships or belong to the governing body, they take all degrees, they are electors, they vote, but they cannot form part of the governing body. I suppose I shall have a number of them supporting me at the next election—at least I trust so. Well, the first thing done consequent upon the Commission was to establish non-foundation scholarships which Roman Catholics can hold, and which are very good things. I have received a letter from the Bursar, in which he tells me there is no limit to the number; they are given as often as meritorious men present themselves for them. Mr. Fagan said that we had not done enough, that something more must be done. My noble Friend the Member for Cockermouth (Lord Naas) was at that time Chief Secretary for Ireland, and he sat down to work the matter out. A number of valuable studentships were established of £100 a year for seven years, beginning from the date of the Bachelor's degree. They are tenable along with the non-foundation scholarships, and the holder may travel or do what he pleases during his tenure. I am informed that several Roman Catholic gentlemen have defeated their classmates and obtained these substantial honours. Roman Catholics have now open to them at the University a number of important posts about the University. The Law Professorship is open to them, the Natural Philosophy Professorship, the two Mathematical Professorships, the History, Astronomy, Arabic, Civil Engineering, Geology, Mineralogy, French, Italian, Political Economy, and other Professorships. The Sizarships, thirty in number, are open to them, the non-foundation scholarships, which are unlimited in number, and the fourteen studentships also. The Roman Catholic gentry still enter the University in about the same numbers as ever. There have been educated some of the most eminent men who have sat in this House. Mr. Wyse, Chief Baron Wollff, Mr. Sheil, and Mr. O'Connell's sons were brought up there; and when was it discovered that their religion was in jeopardy? What shall we say of Mr. Justice Keogh, who, by the way, has just had the incredible folly to deliver a lecture on Milton, in which he described some of his prose works as being equal to his verse, and has been denounced for it by the head of his Church, who equally denounces these Colleges, and frankly avows his determination to put an end for ever to mixed education in Ireland? According to that authority no Roman Catholic is to enter our University again; and even as matters stand, it is doubtful whether the sacrament should not be withdrawn from those who have sent their sons to the University. Similar sentiments, I believe, have been uttered by other bishops in regard to the Queen's Colleges. And these are what are called liberal and enlightened sentiments! If I were asked what I would refuse to the Roman Catholics in the University, I would say, "Nothing." Let them come freely and enjoy the full benefits of the University: their religious opinions will never be interfered with, nor is it true to say that the heads of the University are intolerant men. I only wish that the Roman Catholic gentlemen should enjoy all the benefits of the University and that they should harmonize with it. I cannot see without the greatest pain the attempt which is being made to establish, as it were, a State within a State—to lay down the rule that the Roman Catholic and Protestant youth of the country shall be separated from their cradles to their graves. It is a proposal against which I shall never cease to contend. I ought to-night to have presided at the final debate of the Historical Society in our University. In that Society were first heard the eloquent voices of Burke, and Flood—there Curran, Grattan, Bushe, and

Plunket made their first oratorical essays, and there now Protestant and Roman Catholic youth mingle and interchange their sentiments in manly emulation. In the debate fixed for to-night I see that two of the speakers are Protestants and two Roman Catholics. Such societies as these Historical Societies, the athletic games of our youth, and the other amusements in which students mingle freely together, I call a most important part of education; and now we are told by the head of the Roman Catholic Church that it is highly wrong and immoral to send the Catholic youth of the country to places where they can mix with the Protestant youth, with whom, up to the present time, they have been in daily intercourse. Are the Roman Catholic youth to be driven from this University because they can get a better education somewhere else? Can you get a better astronomer than Sir William Hamilton? Can you have a better teacher of medicine than Dr. Stokes? I admit that it was wrong to debar Nonconformists from taking degrees at Oxford and Cambridge; but in our country we corrected that mistake half a century since. If, then, it is not to obtain a better education elsewhere, I ask what is the object of the Motion? I ask hon. Gentlemen in their consciences to answer whether the object is not this—to separate the youth of Ireland into two classes, and to send the Protestants to one College and the Roman Catholics to another, at the head of which was placed one whom I remember the late Dr. Whately saying he had known at Oxford—Dr. Newman? It is impossible to say that there is any necessity for such an institution. There is a College for Roman Catholic clergy; there are three Colleges for Roman Catholic laity; and, besides that, there is the other great University to which they have access. Before granting a charter to this new University, which I take to be the real drift of the Motion, I would wish the House to consider who are to be the visitors, who is to be the President, what are to be the powers of the Crown; because if, as I am told, there are to be no visitatorial powers and no right of interference on the part of the Crown, I do not understand what the college is to be. I am sorry that this Motion should have been brought forward on the eve of a general election. It would have been better to have brought it forward at an earlier period, when we could have had plans and details fully stated, and when we should not have had the indefinite statement of the right hon. Gentleman as to what he may do when he consults the authorities and has asked the opinions of all those who are engaged in the great work of education. I hope he will not omit to inquire what is the real opinion, in the depths of their hearts, of the Roman Catholic gentry. Are they of opinion that there ought to be that line of separation now drawn which their forefathers so strongly denounced in 1795? I am asked how is that my affair? I contend that it is the affair of all of us. We are all bound to ask what is best for us and for our countrymen. In conclusion, I would remind the House and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) that when a Motion was introduced from this side of the House which seemed to trench upon the sacred ground of mixed education, the right hon. Gentleman, speaking for the Government, declared he could never give his support to any system of sectarian education. Upon two subsequent occasions the same principle was vehemently asserted, and when we asked for a grant of books to the ragged schools it was refused because it was said, and truly said, that the Commandments were taught there. I admit there was a principle in those cases. But how is that principle reconcilable with what the right hon. Gentleman is going to do? Is the policy that which has been announced of endeavouring to separate the respectable, loyal, dutiful subjects of the Crown in Ireland who are Roman Catholics from their Protestant brethren, by confining them to one College, while their fellow-subjects of a different creed are to go to another? It seems to be inconsistent with the belief that all these young men can be actuated in after life by the same hope, and desire, of contributing to the good of a common country. Believing that to be a dangerous principle, I think the House should consider long and well before it assents to its adoption.

Mr. MONSELL said, he did not know that he had ever heard a speech which caused him so much astonishment as that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University. Why, he had over and over again heard that right hon. Gentleman use all his eloquence to denounce a system of mixed education—[Mr. Whiteside: That is a mistake.]—and now he came forward to object to a proposition which was substantially agreed to by the Secretary of State, to allow Catholics to obtain a Catholic education for their children. Taking the case of the Dublin University, he (Mr. Monsell) did not mean to say one word against the learning and the merits of the Professors of that body, which he admitted reflected credit upon the country; but every single educator of youth in that University must be a member of the Church of England, and most of them were Protestant clergymen. The right hon. Gentleman's notion of a fair system of mixed education for Roman Catholic youths was to send them to be taught by Protestant clergy in a Protestant University. How, after that, the right hon. Gentleman could presume to offer advice to Roman Catholic gentry or parents passed belief. He would just ask the right hon. Gentleman a question as a test of his sincerity. Would he vote for a measure to admit Roman Catholics to the governing body of the University?

MR. WHITESIDE: Certainly not, because it would be directly contrary to the foundation of the University.

MR. MONSELL: That, then, is the only reason—a scrupulous respect for the authority of law and the foundation statutes. Passing from the right hon. Gentleman's speech, he would ask the House to consider the practical working of the present system of granting University degrees in Ireland. All would agree that it was desirable to elevate the people, and he would test the present system by its results. There was, undoubtedly, among the great mass of Catholics in Ireland a conscientious objection against sending their children to the Queen's College or to Trinity College. They were, therefore, compelled to allow their children to forego the advantage of University degrees. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the class of persons in Ireland who would be likely to send their children to a University was very small, and referred to extracts from a pamphlet to prove his statement. A reference to the Census of 1861, however, showed that of the class which was composed of professional men, landed proprietors, and others of the proprietary classes, the proportion was 5,339 Catholics, 5,799 members of the Church of England, and 1,200 Presbyterians. Of those receiving superior education in universities, seminaries, and schools in Ireland there were 6,292 Catholics, 5,261 members of the Church of England, and 749 Presbyterians. According to the best information he could obtain the number of Roman Catholics who took degrees in Ireland was not more than twenty-five or thirty a year out of a population of four-and-a-half millions. In the superior schools they would find that, of the pupils above fifteen years of age receiving education, 42 per cent were Roman Catholics, 30 per cent belonged to the Established Church, and 25 per cent were Presbyterians; these figures clearly leading to the inference that the number of Roman Catholics taking degrees would be largely increased—and, indeed, would exceed those of other religions—if parents could send their sons to the University without violating their conscientious convictions. He would now go to a subject which was well worthy of consideration. What was the object for which the Queen's Colleges were established? They were founded in order to get the education out of the hands of the priests as far as possible, to secure united education, and to raise the intellectaal standard. No one would suspect him of complaining that the priests were allowed to participate in the education of youth, but it could not be denied that those colleges had not succeeded in taking the education out of their hands. It must be rather startling to the advocates of the scheme to find that 78 per cent of the whole number of the Catholic youth were receiving education at the hands of the religious orders. He was afraid that he should greatly shock the feelings of the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) when he stated that the Professors and Heads of the Queen's Colleges, and even Members of the Senate, were not altogether pure in this matter. He found that Sir Robert Kane, the President of the College at Cork, though his language might have led one to anticipate a different result, had sent his own son to be educated in a Jesuit seminary; and the same course had been pursued by other members of the governing bodies of those colleges. In the same way it would be found that those gentlemen who advocated in the loudest manner the system of united education would endeavour, when they had to decide in the case of their own children, to secure for them, in conjunction with intellectual advantages, instruction in that religion which they believed to be the true one, and educated them as well for the other world as for this.

During the last fifty years the Catholics had had much to do to provide for the absolute necessities of worship, and they had been unable to provide adequate means of education. He should be sorry to cast any reflection upon the superior schools in Ireland, but it could not be denied that the education imparted at these institutions was not of so high a character as could be wished. It was impossible it should be otherwise. In the case of Eton, Winchester, and other public schools in England, the masters of these schools themselves came from the Universities; and a keen competition was maintained between the pupils, not only at the schools, but also at the Universities. But the Catholic youth of Ireland had no such stimulus to emulation. He was informed, consequently, that at these superior schools the study of Greek was at the lowest possible ebb. Latin composition, too, was neglected; and even mathematics, for which the Irish youth had so remarkable a capacity, were taught in anything but a satisfactory manner. The higher system of education, therefore, introduced into Ireland by the institution of the Queen's Colleges, could not but be regarded as a complete failure, and he might mention that he recollected Earl Russell saying that he believed that unless the system were altered it would become not only "null but noxious." He then came to the question as to what was to be done, and here he might say he that could not concur in the opinion that the speech delivered by the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Home Department was indefinite. He believed that they ought to have a common University for the purpose of granting degrees, and they ought also to have colleges from which the students could come to compete for those degrees. In the case of the London University two Colleges were founded. University College was founded upon the principle of the mixed or secular system, and King's College upon the exclusive or denominational system. The students of those two Colleges competed for degrees and honours; but the secular system of the one College did not in any way interfere with the denominational system of the other. The proposal made by Her Majesty's Government with respect to Ireland was precisely similar, and he thought that such a system would, on the whole, be the best one, and it was the system that prevailed in most of the civilized nations in Europe. Such a plan would not only secure to the students a high intellectual cultivation, but might also be accompanied by perfect moral control. He believed, too, that the day was not far distant when the system would be extended to Oxford and Cambridge, though the Colleges might still retain a distinct and definite system of religious instruction. He thought that by adopting such a course Her Majesty's Government had conferred the greatest blessings upon Ireland, and would conduce to the dissemination of a higher intellectual education throughout the country than at present existed. He believed that the results would not only be remarkable on account of the moral and religious training of the youth of the country, but also an account of the intellectual results of having a great national seminary belonging to that religion which the mass of the people professed.

Mr. HENNESSY wished to say a word or two upon what he considered the extraordinary statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin. The right hon. and learned Gentleman told the House that Dr. Croly was friendly to the Queen's Colleges.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that what he had said in respect to Dr. Croly he had stated upon the authority of one of the Commissioners of Education, who had been sent round the country to ascertain the views of the bishops with regard to the best sites for the Colleges, and who had given evidence on the subject.

Mr. HENNESSY would refer to what the late Sir R. Peel said in respect to the sentiments of the Catholic bishops, including Dr. Croly. On the 23rd of June, 1845, when the question of the Queen's Colleges was under discussion in that House, Sir R. Peel noticed the fact that the Irish Catholic bishops were unanimously against the measure; and to a petition presented to that House declaring that the principles of the proposed colleges were contrary to religious faith and morals the signature of Dr. Croly, as well as the other Catholic bishops, was attached.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that the examination to which he referred was subsequent, in point of time, to the events in question.

Mr. HENNESSY could assure the right hon. Gentleman that Dr. Croly never altered the opinion expressed in the petition. The Roman Catholic bishops had been from the beginning, and were now unanimous against the Colleges, and when the right hon. Gentleman asserted that it was Dr. Cullen who had produced this change it was clear he was imperfectly informed on the subject. The Government had taken an extraordinary course. They had acknowledged the truth of the allegations of the Resolution, and so far the Roman Catholics were bound to thank them. The Home Secretary had suggested a remedy for removing the conscientious scruples of the Roman Catholic body, and had suggested that a Roman Catholic University should have an opportunity of sending students to be examined by the Queen's University for degrees. The students of Carlow College could come to London and be examined by the London University for a degree. The right hon. Gentleman now proposed that the Roman Catholic University of Ireland should be turned into a second Carlow College; but such a proposal would not find the same favour with the Roman Catholic body which it had found with the right hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell). Such a proposal amounted to an assertion that the same conscientious scruples were still to continue, because such a proposition had been made over and over again, and had been invariably objected to. The Roman Catholic bishops were unanimously of opinion that the education given in such a University ought to be denominational. The University of Quebec was Roman Catholic. The examiners and teachers and the governing body were exclusively Roman Catholic; and so it must be in every University which hoped to satisfy the claims of the Roman Catholic bishops and laity. So long as any compromise did not satisfy the Roman Catholic bishops it was a failure. The right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of State, proposed to give degrees to any well ordered school. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman that the compromise he had proposed would be a total failure—the only result of such a scheme would be to degrade the Queen's University, and would not satisfy the Roman Catholic body. The majority of the Protestant bishops of Ireland, like the Catholic bishops, were opposed to the mixed system of education, and the heads of all denominations shared in the same objection. The Church of England had Trinity College, and he should be sorry to see it thrown open. The mixed education party were powerful enough to be represented, and he should like to see one or two colleges for them. Next came the Roman Catholics who wanted a denominational University, and if Her Majesty's Government really desired to meet their just claims, they would place them, in regard to the advantages of education, on precisely the same footing as all other religious denominations, and who would be satisfied by nothing less.

Lord DUNKELLIN said, he desired to offer a few observations in order that his vote might not be misunderstood. He was sorry to hear the hon. Member who brought this subject before the House (The O'Donoghue) in a speech which had been justly commended, go out of his way to depreciate the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University of Ireland. He (Lord Dunkellin) begged leave to differ from his hon. Friend *in toto* in that respect. He could not agree that these institutions were generally unpopular in Ireland, or that the education given by the colleges was not of a sufficiently high, good, and practical character. Nor could he admit that, tested either by the numbers upon the books, or the number of degrees taken by the students, the colleges were a failure. The Queen's University flourished in spite of the great opposition with which it had been encountered, and there had been a steady and marked increase in the pupils at the colleges. It was worthy of remark that as the Roman Catholic element had increased so did the Protestant. It was not altogether fair to judge of the usefulness of the Colleges by the degrees. A great many of the students belonged to the higher middle class, who were obliged to enter upon the duties of life without going through the full curriculum which would qualify them to take their degrees. The question was, did the Queen's Colleges afford a good, sound, practical education, suited to enable their pupils to fight their way through life with credit to themselves, and credit to them who educated them? He asserted, without fear of contradiction, that they did so. If they looked to the competitive examinations which had taken place within the last few years for the India service, for the civil service, for the army and navy, they would find that prizes had been carried off by those who were educated at the Queen's Colleges. He also differed from the hon. Gentleman as to the popularity in which these institutions were held in the country. The Galway College had flourished in the face of all opposition, and was eminently popular. Turning to the more immediate question before the House, as to whether a charter should be granted to the Catholic University, he asked why was it required? He understood it was required because a great portion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland had conscientious objections to profit by the means of University education already existing. He should be the last to disregard the conscientious objection of any creed. If conscientious objections prevented them from going to Trinity College, Dublin—if conscientious objections prevented them from attending the Queen's University—let them have an University of their own. He thought what had been proposed by his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department fairly met all objections, and placed Roman Catholics in a position with regard to diplomas and degrees to which they could not object. He was rather surprised to hear the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) take exception to the proposal of his right hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Monsell). The question of the charter was promoted by Roman Catholic gentlemen on the ground that at present their sons were debarred from University education. They objected to Trinity College, because the professors were Episcopolian clegymen; and to Queen's College, because the professors there might be of no religion; but at the Catholic University the sons of Roman Catholics would study under professors of their own creed, and be watched and fostered with all the care of a fond parent, and after going through a curriculum of intellectual labour and moral supervision they might compete with students brought up elsewhere. This would place them in fair, honest, generous competition with their compeers; and in this free practical nineteenth-century education it would be for Roman Catholic gentlemen, if they could, to distance their competitors. He would not support the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee, if he thought that it would injuriously affect the Queen's Colleges; but, believing that no such consequences would ensue, he would vote in favour of the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, though he by no means concurred in the censure he cast upon the Queen's University or the Queen's Colleges.

MR. O'REILLY said, he was not one of those who wished to have a grievance for the sake of a grievance; on the contrary, he was always most anxious to meet any fair proposal to accede to the wishes of the Catholics of Ireland in a frank and cordial spirit, even if at first sight it did not meet his views adequately, to give every weight to the good intentions by which it was animated, and, if possible, develop it satisfactorily to all parties. It was with that view that he addressed himself to the consideration of the views expressed and the scheme sketched out by the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Before doing so he would make one observation with reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for the King's County. The hon. Member had truly stated that the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Roman Catholic authorities throughout the world had unanimously expressed an opinion that University education should be denominational, because they held that religion should be interwoven with every branch of education. But while they held that education, which meant instruction, teaching, developing the faculties, improving the mind, should be denominational, the tests of education need not be denominational, but might be united or mixed. That was the case in Belgium; and in 1851 the principle was formally approved in France. How far did the necessity for some measure such as that proposed exist in Ireland? Such a necessity did exist; for while, according to the statistics quoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick, Roman Catholics embraced from 25 to 40 per cent of the better classes and professions they possessed University degrees in the proportion of only 14 per cent. Then came the question, How was the difficulty to be met? The one which he considered the most perfect and the most applicable to the condition of Ireland was, that as they had in Trinity College an University that was essentially Protestant, they should establish an University that should be essentially Roman Catholic. At the same time he was ready to admit that the whole course of modern legislation in this, as well as in other countries, tended to change those ancient institutions which existed when the whole country was of one religion, and to make the test of education applicable to all religious denominations. He owned, therefore, that there was a strong reason to induce the Government to declare that the test should be one for all denominations, and that there should not be any longer a denominational examining University. This principle had been adopted with great success by the University of London, to which he himself and other Members of that House belonged. There were two ways of constituting such a University as to embrace all parties and all religions. One was the system which had been adopted originally by the London University—that of affiliating colleges; and the other that which had ultimately been carried out by that University, by which the Senate was simply nominated in the first instance by the Government, and all students came up to be examined as units. If the latter plan were adopted in Ireland it would not be acceptable to the great body of the Roman Catholics, because this serious difficulty had been felt—the body which directed and controlled the examinations necessarily, although indirectly, directed and controlled the course of education, and, as the different affiliated branches were not at all represented on the Senate, the latter might unwittingly place on its examination lists subjects and books which might be objected to. In illustration of this, he might mention that the Senate of the London University having appointed *Paley's Ethics* as a necessary subject of examination, the Roman Catholic students positively declined to prove Paley's principle of utility as the criterion of actions, and a compromise was effected by the Examiners allowing the Catholic students to confute those principles. But the method which had been adopted in France by the law of 1852 on the subject of education was an excellent one. By that method the Senate of the French General University was made to consist of twenty-eight members, and every great body in the State was officially represented in it. The Government was represented by the Minister of Public Instruction, the Roman Catholics by a Bishop or Archbishop elected by his colleagues, the Protestants by a member elected in their consistories, the free colleges by official members, and so on. If that precedent, or something in the same spirit, were adopted in constructing the University body in Ireland, by whatever name it was to be called, he believed it would meet the wishes of nearly all who were interested in the subject. He spoke usually only his own sentiments, but he had some reason to say that in expressing that opinion he expressed the opinion of a large body of those who might be considered to some extent to represent the Roman Catholics of Ireland. If the granting of University degrees and the framing of the course of examination necessary to attain them were to be the work of a body upon which all classes would be necessarily and adequately represented it would, he believed, give satisfaction to the Roman Catholics of Ireland; and he also believed that the proposal sketched out by the right hon. Gentleman contained the principles upon which that plan might be carried out.

MR. NEWDEGATE believed that the House had been taken by surprise by the evidently foregone conclusion on the part of the Government to found some institution in the nature of a Roman Catholic University. The question was being discussed without adequate information as to the plan proposed. Unless some further information was afforded, he should think it his duty, on the first practicable day, to move that the Government should furnish the House with the details of the plan they contemplated. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whiteside) had explained that there was nothing in the educational institutions of Ireland which either created or perpetuated the exclusion of which complaint had been made. As to the complaint of inequality, it was only just to preceding Governments and to Parliament to say that this inequality was not of their making, but was due entirely to the Papacy. The Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland were instructed by the Papacy to object to the Queen's University, and forbid the youth of Ireland from availing themselves of the educational facilities offered by the University of Dublin. He was apprehensive that, unless great care was taken in the organization of the contemplated University, the same principle of exclusion which had been practised at Maynooth, by which the Roman Catholic laity had been excluded from that college, would be practised, and the contemplated university would become as exclusively Roman Catholic as Maynooth was now exclusively ecclesiastical—as exclusively Roman Catholic, and probably Ultramontane, in its teaching as the right hon. Member for Limerick had explained that the National Schools of Ireland had become, which he informed the House were now largely under the control of the regular orders of the Church of Rome. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman was a great admirer of the Jesuits and of the other regular orders of the Papacy, and considered the laws of this country against the existence of these orders in the United Kingdom very absurd. The opinions of the right hon. Gentleman were well known. In justice, however, to preceding Governments and preceding Parliaments, he (Mr. Newdegate) must be permitted to observe that the modern history of Europe and the recent experience and conduct of European Governments, especially those of France and Italy, redeemed the conduct of preceding Parliaments of this country from the imputation of ignorance and bigotry in the safeguards which they had raised against the machinations and practices of these Roman orders. Roman Catholic Members themselves were full of complaints of the state of Ireland itself, though it was favoured by the presence of these orders. In this country the feeling would be that there was nothing to account for this change of policy on the part of the Government except the pressure which had been brought to bear upon successive Governments by an organization of which the authorities of the Church of Rome were cognizant. He believed that this announcement would be received with surprise by the country. He had on a former occasion adverted to a very remarkable document issued by the Papacy, and the circulation of which by Roman Catholic prelates had been forbidden in France; and he now begged leave to read some of the propositions which would be inculcated on those who, under the plan of the Government, would, by virtue of this Utramontane tuition, become candidates for degrees. The fifteenth Proposition condemned by the Pope in the Syllabus which was attached to the Encyclical Letter, dated the 8th of December, 1864, was—

> "Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason."

Thus the Government were about to provide for granting degrees to those who should be thoroughly impregnated with the belief that the primary maxim of religious freedom is a damnable error. The eighteenth proposition condemned by the Papacy in the same document, was the opinion that—

> "Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion in which it is possible to please God equally as in the Catholic Church."

The converse of this proposition was another item of the religious instruction which the Government were about to declare a qualification for a degree, and this in the cause of liberalty and freedom. In connection with the propositions he had quoted, as condemned, no later than December last, by the Papacy, he would beg the attention of the House to the 77th—

> "In the present day it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship."
>
> "78th: Whence it has been wisely provided by law in some countries, called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the free exercise of their own worship."

Now, let the House remember that the converse—the doctrines the exact opposite of these opinions he quoted—are emphatically asserted by the Papacy by the condemnation of these opinions, which are the opinions upon which the legislation of this country is founded and upon which the Government pretend to act. The 37th proposition, which is condemned by the Papacy in the Syllabus, is as follows—

> "National Churches can be established after being withdrawn and separated from the authority of the Roman Pontiff."

Hence the existence of the Church of this country as by law established will be treated as a moral offence in the religious teaching, upon proficiency acquired under which, the Government propose to confer degrees; and this is exemplified by the preceding proposition, the 36th—

> "The definition of a National Council does not admit of any subsequent discussion, and the civil power can settle an affair, as decided by such National Council."

By the condemnation of this proposition, the Papacy at once defies the power of Parliament, and exacts compliance from those of the Roman Catholic communion. Again, and in a higher sense, the 54th proposition is condemned—

> "Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church in litigated questions."

Thus are all condemned who maintain Her Majesty's rightful supremacy, and the independence of the Administrative power of this and every other country; while the 24th proposition, which is condemned, stands thus—

> "The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power."

Here is a direct assertion, by the condemnation of the converse proposition, of the right of the Roman Pontiff to temporal power in this and every other State, and of the right to use force to establish and maintain that power. Such are the doctrines issued so late as the 8th of December last by the Papacy, for the inculcation of which upon the youth of Ireland, as matters of religion, the Government of Her Majesty are making provision, and for proficiency in which they are about to confer degrees; and this, I suppose, they will say, in the cause of Liberalism and freedom. It would appear strange to the people of England that so soon after these propositions were enounced by Rome, that, on the plea of liberalism, a step should be taken to afford an opportunity of educating the youth of Ireland in these most intolerent principles. The people of England would be inclined to believe that the Church of Rome already exercised a power on this country which rendered it impossible for any Government to resist for any length of time her decrees. What means the people of England might adopt for the defence of their own independence, and the freedom of their fellow subjects of Catholic faith, he knew not; but he felt that they ought to be informed that there existed a power in the United Kingdom capable of exacting first from one Government and then from another concessions, not in the sense of modern civilization and enlightenment, or in the spirit of progress—for all these the Pope had formally rejected and condemned in the same documents from which he had quoted—but in the sense of the exclusion and of the bigotry which characterized Rome in the Middle Ages. He lamented the decision which the Government had come to; but he would not in the present state of the House attempt to test its opinion.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Newdegate), seems, as is rather common with his speeches, intended to act on the nerves of the House. He has made a selection of most startling and alarming propositions from a document recently issued by the Court of Rome, but which appear to me to have very little relevancy to the question before the House. So far as the language of those propositions is applicable to the present discussion, it ought, as it seems to me, to be an encouragement to us to go forward steadily in the path in which my right hon. Friend (Sir George Grey) has announced that we mean to tread, because the more harsh, rigid, and restrictive our measures may be towards the Roman Catholic community in this country, the more we leave them under the direct influence of Rome, and throw them into the hands of those in the Roman Catholic Church who profess extreme opinions. I so far sympathise with the hon. Member as to contemplate, in common with the great majority of this House, those propositions with great aversion, and I deeply regret their issue from any centre of religious authority. They have, however, on me an effect directly opposite to that which they appear to exercise on the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, and I would wish, as far as possible, to remove all tendency to look with favour on such propositions by endeavouring to attach our Roman Catholic fellow subjects more distinctly and more closely to Englishmen generally, and to the interests and habits of this country. The hon. Gentleman stated that he thought the declaration of my right hon. Friend must have taken the House by surprise. Now the first effect of our surprise is to produce attention; but surprise has not produced attention in the hon. Member, for, if he had listened ever so cursorily to the speech of my right hon. Friend, it would have been impossible for him to have described it as the announcement of an intention on the part of the Government that they are about to found a Roman Catholic University. The most pointed part of that speech was directed to this proposition—that the Government did not think it fit or expedient, so far as the intervention of the Government is concerned, to accede to any plan for the foundation of a Roman Catholic University. The right hon. Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Whiteside) did certainly seem to look on with some sort of qualified approbation at the proposition to found such a University. He greatly preferred that plan, he said, to the one proposed by the Government. Under these circumstances I hope that the right hon. Gentleman and the Member for North Warwickshire will employ some portion of the approaching recess in settling the difference which appears to exist between them in that respect. But although the right hon. Member for the University of Dublin said he looked with comparative favour on the idea of giving a charter to a Roman Catholic University, yet the whole of his agument was not only not in favour of a charter to a Roman

Catholic University, but it was distinctly to this effect—that the Roman Catholics were extremely well treated in the University of Dublin—that with that good treatment they ought to be content, and should desire nothing more. That was the pith of his entire speech. Let me not be supposed to speak with any disrespect either of the constitution or the administration of the University of Dublin. I believe its constitution is liberal according to the conditions of its foundation, and that its administration, as far as I may presume to give an opinion on that point, is conducted in the spirit of that constitution. Nevertheless it is one thing to be admitted individually into an institution founded upon the principles of a religious communion different from your own, and another thing to have your children educated within the walls of an institution founded upon the rules and laws of your own religion. I want to know what right we have to find fault with those Roman Catholics who prefer the latter system. The right hon. Gentleman himself prefers the latter system; and I am sure that if he lived in a country where the only choice offered him was that of sending his children to a Roman Catholic University, where they would receive their instruction at the hands of Roman Catholic teachers, he would say distinctly, and I think justifiably, "I greatly prefer to have, and I shall use every effort to obtain, the means of having my own children educated in my own religion from the mouths and under the influence of teachers belonging to my own Church." The right hon. Gentleman put a pointed question to the Government. He asked us, "How can you possibly justify your refusal to make any concession to the Church Education Society conformably with the intention you have announced to-night with regard to the Roman Catholics?" Why, Sir, the intention announced by my right hon. Friend to-night is to remove from the Roman Catholics certain disabilities under which they at present labour—disabilities of a positive character; not merely the want of honorary distinctions, but the want of degrees, the absence or default of which subjects them either to a longer probation before they can enter a profession in which they are to earn their livelihood, or else involves their repulsion from that profession altogether. What does that state of things amount to? Disguise it how you may, it is the imposition of civil disabilities on account of religious opinion—on account of religious opinion, which is not, I grant, perhaps universally entertained by Roman Catholics; there are, I rejoice, many Roman Catholics, and I wish there were many more, who do not object to the united education given in the Queen's Colleges; but there are many Roman Catholics, as has been distinctly proved, who either object absolutely to that system, or prefer a system which they think more perfect. That is an opinion which they hold as part of their religious belief and obligation, and for it they are at this moment subjected to civil disabilities. And what my right hon. Friend has announced is not that there is to be a Roman Catholic University, but that that civil disability is to be removed. Has there been any question raised to-night like that raised on behalf of the schools of the Church Education Society? No. What is demanded on behalf of that Society is a share of the public money; and if the present Motion had involved any such distinct demand upon the public purse, then, so far, the parallel sought to be established by the right hon. Gentleman would have had some show of justice. But, with regard to the Queen's Colleges, the right hon. Gentleman made a very broad assertion. He said that all those who belonged to the present Government were departing from the declarations, and attempting to reverse the policy of the last thirty years. Now, the Queen's Colleges were not recommended to Parliament nor adopted by Parliament as embodying a perfect system of education, but simply as the best arrangement which the circumstances of Ireland then permitted. Lord Russell distinctly stated at the time that in his opinion the plan, as far as respected positive religious teaching, was very defective. Another Member of the present Government spoke in somewhat the same sense, at the same time, however, giving his vote as Lord Russell also gave his, for the scheme proposed by Sir Robert Peel, on the ground that it was adapted to the peculiar circumstances of Ireland. It is quite a mistake to suppose that Sir Robert Peel pronounced these Colleges to be a system so perfect that nothing could be allowed to stand in competition with it. He pointed out the great want of academical institutions in Ireland, and then addressed himself in a practical spirit to how that want could best be supplied. He said that if they were to have academical institutions in Ireland he saw no other mode of securing that advantage but by the establishment of some such system as that, and he justified it by the peculiar and unfortunate religious differences there existing. Again, Sir Robert Peel said, that upon the whole, he thought that, under the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, they stood a better chance of success by adopting a system under which the religious education would be placed on the footing that he proposed than by attempting to found separate theological establishments or by appointing separate theological professors for each College; and he went on to show that the view of the late Sir Robert Inglis, who denounced what he deemed the want of positive religious teaching in these Colleges, and who desired that there should be a full infusion of the religious element in its instruction, really came, when properly examined, to nothing less than the forcing upon a Roman Catholic community of the teaching of the Church of England! It would, indeed, be much against the will and desire of the present Government if it were to be supposed that, in acceding to the general wish expressed by the Motion of the hon. Member for Tralee, they were expressing any change of their intentions in regard to the Queen's Colleges. To those Colleges, before they were called into actual existence, an epithet was applied in that House the severity of which had never been mitigated, and no doubt the religious element was not included in their teaching directly and authoritatively. But I am sure that no one who recollects the nature of the discussion which took place in 1845—I go further, and say that no one who knows the character of the illustrious statesman by whom the plan of those colleges was propounded—would for one moment dream that there ever was an intention to place them in opposition to the inculcation of religion in its most distinct and definite form. I believe that in the case of Belfast the facilities which he offered have been fully made use of, and that, practically, religious education has been given there in connection with these Colleges. I can speak not only on my own behalf, but I am sure also on behalf of my Colleagues, when I say that most happy shall we be to see a similar disposition to turn those facilities to account shown by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, and likewise to find the Queen's Colleges not only flourishing as they do now, but striking their roots more widely and deeply in the affections of the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. But we have this fact before us—that, with these Colleges existing, there is a great gap to be filled up. There is a large portion of the Roman Catholic community which does not accept academical education on the terms upon which it is at present offered; and I believe we are acting in the spirit of the policy of 1845 by adopting the practical means we propose for supplying the existing lack. The hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy), who presented an exception to the general tone of the speeches made by the Irish Members to-night, announced on his own authority that under no circumstances can there be the adoption of any offer less than that of the foundation of an exclusively Roman Catholic University—exclusive, I mean, not in the sense of shutting its doors against all pupils save those of that persuasion, but in respect to Government and direction. But that hon. Gentleman has been contradicted by other Irish Members, and particularly by the hon. and gallant Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly), who is, perhaps, not less accustomed or less authorized to speak on behalf of the communion to which he belongs. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) and other Gentlemen from Ireland, have also accepted in the most kindly spirit the profers of my right hon. Friend, and given to Government every encouragement to proceed with the plan they have announced, by holding out the expectation, not only that it will be favourably received, but likewise that it will have great effect in meeting the existing want. One or two important points of detail have been alluded to in the debate. The hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly) said he thought it would be most desirable that the different colleges which might be affiliated to the Queen's University under an enlarged charter should be represented in the Senate of the University, and that not according to the accidents of individual character, but by some fixed rules which should secure the permanence of that representation. No doubt it will be desirable that when the Queen's University undertakes the enlarged functions which my right hon. Friend has sketched out it should be under the government of a body proportioned to the extent of those functions; but, at the same time, it would be premature now to enter into a detailed consideration of the manner in which the Senate of the University might be best made to harmonize with the work it has to perform. But I might venture to state that Her Majesty's Government are, as it is obvious they must be, open to the force of the general observation that has been made, and it is quite plain, in order to fulfil the usefulness it is intended to perform, that it must be so constituted and composed in its governing body as to possess the confidence of those who were to partake of it. The right hon. Member for Limerick has also referred to a similar matter to that referred to by the hon. and gallant Member for Longford, which is also one of great importance. I understood them to say that there must be a very careful selection of the colleges or bodies that are to be affiliated to the University, and of their power of sending up pupils for degrees; and his hon. Friend had made an allusion to the change that was recently made in the composition of the University of London. As it was originally founded it received no pupils except from a limited number of colleges, and the qualification of the colleges was much regarded as a condition previous to their being entitled to send up young men to the examinations. Now, I believe, the constitution of the University of London has been very much enlarged in that respect, and very little, if any, distinction is now drawn between one school and another. I understand my right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick and the hon. and gallant Gentleman to say that in Ireland such a system would be rather injurious than beneficial.

Mr. O'REILLY explained, that he did not mean to suggest that there should be any restriction as to the persons who might present themselves for examination, but only that different institutions should be represented upon the Senate.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Well, certainly my right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick expressed the opinion to which I have referred. That, of course, is a matter which it would be the duty of the Government to consider very carefully, because it must not be assumed that precisely the same regulations which are at any given time desirable in England must necessarily, at the same moment, be expedient in Ireland. I do not think that we shall see any fulfilment of the prophecy of the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), that great alarm will be produced in this country by the proposal of my right hon. Friend, which is, in point of fact, only to place the Roman Catholics of Ireland in the same position with regard to academical degrees as that which the Roman Catholics of England here occupied for many years, without any alarm or dissatisfaction, or any prejudice or injury, as far as I am aware, to any Member of this community. With reference to the remarks of my hon. Friend the Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy), I think that the speech of my right hon. Friend must have shown that the Government were not disposed to reject rudely and without consideration the direct proposal to found a Roman Catholic University. There are three classes of reasons which have mainly led the Government to the conclusion that it would not be wise to accede to that suggestion. One of them has been fairly and candidly stated by the hon. Member for Longford, who admitted that, whatever might be his own preferences, the course of legislation and of events is adverse to the foundation of exclusive Universities, and like a wise man he is not willing to place himself needlessly in opposition to the course of legislation which now prevails; and the second is, that it would obviously be impossible to raise the question of granting a charter to a Roman Catholic University with the power of granting degrees, without involving ourselves in many of those sectarian difficulties which there could be no advantage in raising with regard to such a subject. But my right hon. Friend dwelt strongly, and I think most justly, upon the reason which is, of itself, sufficient to determine the course which the Government ought to pursue. You have in Ireland already two Universities, and by granting a charter to a Roman Catholic University you would create a third. If you had a University of the Established Church and another belonging to the Roman Catholics, each with a power of granting degrees, the Presbyterians of Ireland would urge a plausible and probably a just claim to have a University to themselves. [Mr. Whiteside: Oh, no!] The right hon. Gentleman's opinion is, no doubt, entitled to great weight, but I doubt very much whether he has received credentials fully authorizing him to state in this House the views of the Presbyterians upon this subject. I apprehend that when their representatives come to speak for themselves they may give a different opinion. At all events, it is a contingency which the Goverument were bound to keep in view, when they were asked to grant a charter for an exclusively Roman Catholic University. Would it, I ask, be desirable that Ireland should have four Universities? Is it desirable, in countries of limited population, to multiply Universities? I think it is not. In Belgium—a country than which, perhaps, none in Europe is more distinguished for sagacity in administration—it has been found necessary to combine all the local Universities under a central, with one fixed standard for the conferring of degrees. In Scotland there are four Universities. It is found that their existence is rather an evil than a good, and it is found so impossible to raise the examining standard to such a point as to give to the Scotch degree the credit which we should desire to see it enjoy, that many eminent men connected with the teaching body of the University of Edinburgh, if no other, would be prepared to accede to a proposal which would abate the nominal rank of the institutions with which they are immediately connected for the sake of establishing one national University for Scotland, and thereby raising the Scotch degree to the highest point of eminence to which it can possibly attain. That is a very important practical consideration. The real value of these honorary titles depends upon the efficient stringency of the examination, and it is exceedingly difficult to maintain that stringency, or to persuade the world that you do maintain it, when the University really means nothing but a college, and when those who have taught the young men afterwards examine them and certify to their efficiency. Oxford and Cambridge are able to contend against this difficulty, in consequence of the multiplicity of separate colleges, which are only locally connected, and all of which have their separate traditions and separate regulations; but if in Ireland a charter were granted to a Roman Catholic University, which would be only a college, and, perhaps, a charter to a Presbyterian University, which would be only a college, instead of a large boon you would be granting only a very small one. The means would not exist of elevating the examination to a sufficient height to sustain the reputation of the degrees; consequently, nobody would value them, and thus the vital principle of academical life, that stimulus to free education, would cease to operate within the walls of those institutions. It is a matter of gratification to the Government to perceive that there appears to be so general a disposition in the House to recognize the reasonableness of the plan which has been proposed by my right hon. Friend. I certainly am of opinion that it would not be right, on account of any possible injury which may be done to the Queen's College—and I hope that none will be done—to continue that which really amounts to the imposition of civil disabilities for religious opinions. The Queen's Colleges were wisely devised to meet a purpose; but we must admit that the colleges were made for the people of Ireland, and not the people of Ireland for the colleges. Our duty is to consider how consistently with the principles of wisdom and justice we can afford, so far as depends upon us, the best means of academic learning to our fellow subjects across the water. I believe that the plan explained by my right hon. Friend will have that tendency in a sensible and very powerful degree; and, so far from exciting alarm or apprehension, I am convinced that it will meet the approval both of this country and of Ireland.

MR. C. MOORE thought the measure would prove satisfactory if properly carried out.

MR. HENLEY said, the speech they had just heard from the Chancellor of the Exchequer contained some remarkable statements; and as he was unfortunately old enough to have taken part in the discussions which took place on the subject of Irish Colleges twenty years ago, he could not allow the question to pass without making a few observations on it. The right hon. Gentleman stated, with great force and truth, the difficulty that must be felt by many persons in sending their children to places where there was no religious education whatever; but he could not reconcile that statement with the strange praise the right hon. Gentleman bestowed upon the present system of education, which he said was the best possible system for the people of Ireland, from which such teaching was altogether excluded. The right hon. Gentleman might be able to reconcile these two conclusions, but he (Mr. Henley) was not. If there was one thing for which the hierarchy of another religious persuasion was entitled to credit, it was for the strenuous manner in which from the beginning they had stepped forward and denounced the system of mixed or godless education—holding out as it did temptations for acquiring a good academical education—as fatal to faith and to morals. He had no intention of giving an opinion upon the scheme proposed, or rather sketched out, by Her Majesty's Government, as he would rather wait and see whether it fulfilled the reasonable expectations it had raised, before he bound himself to support it; but, all events, Her Majesty's Government appeared to think it would supply a large portion of our fellow-subjects with the means of obtaining academical degrees, which at present were out of their reach, except upon terms to which they could not conscientiously agree. He should be sorry to express any opinion as to whether or not the proposed Catholic University would turn out something more than the University of London had done—namely, a mere examination machine to ascertain the fitness of students who came up from different educational institutions to receive academical degrees; but he rejoiced that, after the experience of twenty years, they were now taking another step towards carrying out the principle that the people, whether in England or in Ireland, would not be satisfied with education which was not based upon religion. The admission which had been made on behalf of Her Majesty's Government was thoroughly in favour of denominational education as opposed to mixed education—which meant, in fact, education without religion. The time was certainly approaching, although he could scarcely hope that he should live to see it, when the system of mixed education would be altogether swept away, and denominational education substituted for it. It was every man's natural wish that his children should be brought up in the religion that he believed to be right, and not that they should acquire mere learning, unsupported by those religious principles which would render their education useful to themselves and to their fellow creatures. Experience had shown that the godless system was a failure, except in one instance in the north of Ireland, and in that instance, through the Catholic element withdrawing itself, the mixed College had become a Presbyterian, and, therefore, a denominational College. He hailed the present discussion as a step in the right direction. Once establish a sound principle and it would soon spread. In the first instance it was, perhaps, well that the godless system—as it was called—had been tried. He thanked God that it had failed. He rejoiced in the course the debate had taken, for it was a great step towards advancing denominational education.

Mr. **BRADY** said, he believed that the debate of that night would be memorable in the House and the country, and that the proposition of the right hon. Baronet on behalf of the Government would find acceptance with the people of Ireland. He believed the people of Ireland were ready and willing to make a fair compromise, in order to get rid of a state of things which was the most unpleasant and unsatisfactory that had ever existed. He hailed the tone and temper of the House that night as most satisfactory, and considered that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) would go far to promote the success of the measure the Government intended to introduce, and to secure for it the due consideration of the country. He looked upon the exclusive system of University education as doomed.

Captain **STACPOOLE** expressed satisfaction with the measure promised by the Government, and hoped that the suggestion thrown out by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly) would be carried out.

Sir **GEORGE BOWYER** thought that the Government had made a step in the right direction. A great part of the speech of the right hon. Baronet opposite he had heard, not only with satisfaction, but with admiration. He should, however, be wanting in candour if he did not say that he thought the conclusions to which the right hon. Baronet had come were not entirely satisfactory—those conclusions were so vague that he found it difficult to deal with them. The right hon. Gentleman placed two alternatives before them—either to enlarge the Queen's University in Ireland, so as to enable persons wherever educated to go up for degrees to that University; or, secondly, so to affiliate what was now called the Catholic University in Ireland to the Queen's University, as to enable students of the Catholic University to go up to the Queen's University for the purpose of obtaining degrees. The former of these alternatives appeared to him eminently unsatisfactory, as it placed the Catholic University, which had been formed by the heads of the Catholic body, and possessed the confidence of the great body of the Catholics in Ireland, on the same footing with every petty school in that country. This would not be fitting treatment of the Roman Catholics, who formed the majority of the Irish population. He believed that no system would give satisfaction to the bishops, clergy, and laity of Ireland but that of a Catholic University, and he hoped the Government would grapple with the difficulty and see whether they could not make up their minds to give them such a University. The observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire were worthy of attentive consideration. What had been called the godless system of education was strongly to be reprobated, for no scheme of instruction could be more detestable. The system sketched out by the right hon. Baronet the Home Secretary — that of affiliating the Catholic University to the Queen's University — was a better plan than that of allowing schools in any place, and of any or no religious creed, to send up their pupils for degrees, because the former would necessarily involve a representative of the Catholic College in the Queen's University. He did not say that he should be willing to accept that arrangement; but it was the better of the two alternatives which the right hon. Gentleman had seemed to suggest.

Mr. LEFROY admitted that both sides of the question had been ably and fully stated, and concurred in everything which had been said on the subject by his right hon. Colleague (Mr. Whiteside). He did not think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had fairly stated the views of Sir Robert Peel when he brought forward the question of the Queen's Colleges. He had referred to the speech of that right hon. Baronet, when he found that Sir Robert Peel, so far from stating that religion was to be made part of the system, said that if they wished religious instruction to be given to the people in these academical institutions, provided they got the consent of the guardians, there was nothing in the Bill to interfere with such an arrangement. He was not at present prepared to express an opinion as to the proposition of the Government; but they would have an opportunity of amending it before they were called on to vote upon it. It was most gratifying to him that, with the single exception of the hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Brady), there had been general testimony borne to the part taken by the University of Dublin in respect to education in general. It had granted Roman Catholic degrees in every branch except those connected with the Church, and given scholarships very useful and profitable to those who received them; and he sincerely regretted that the time had come when Roman Catholic Members felt it necessary to separate themselves from that University.

The O'DONOGHUE explained that, in the observations which he had made with reference to the Queen's Colleges, he meant to say that these colleges did not meet the requirements of the Catholics of Ireland. There could be no mistake about the fact that the Government had admitted the truth of the proposition laid down in his Motion, that there were objections to the present system of University education in Ireland, and though they had not thought fit to adopt the plan which he thought it best calculated to remove these objections, still he admitted that the proposition of the Government was one which, when well matured and developed, might possibly be worthy of consideration. He felt that he should not be acting with fairness if he did not express his thanks to the Government for the candid manner in which they had acted, and, with the permission of the House, he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SECRET SERVICE MONEY.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH, in moving for Returns of the expenditure for Secret Service, said, he was induced to make the Motion in consequence of a debate which had taken place a few nights ago in Committee of Supply. His Motion did not interfere with the principle of secresy of appropriation; all it asked was for information as to the proportions of the Secret Service money which each department received. He was surprised to find that the Government intended to object to a Motion of such a mild and inoffensive character. That this might be preliminary to still further inquiries he could not deny; but at present all he asked was the proportions spent by the different Departments. He had heard from a casual source that the great proportion was spent by the Foreign

Office. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving for a Return of the sums which have been paid out of the Secret Service Money by the Treasury to each of the Secretaries of State on his declaration in each year during the last ten years, together with the amount of the balance of such Secret Service Money remaining in the hands of any of the Departments of the Government at the end of each year.

Mr. VANCE, in seconding the Motion, asked whether there was any record existing of the manner in which the money was spent in times gone by—say, seventy or eighty years ago—and, if there were, would there be any objection to its production? The time had come, he thought, when this Vote ought to disappear from the Estimates.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That there be laid before this House a Return of the sums which have been paid out of the Secret Service Money by the Treasury, to each of the Secretaries of State on his declaration in each year, during the last ten years; together with the amount of the balance of such Secret Service Money remaining in the hands of any of the Departments of the Government at the end of each year."—(*Mr. Darby Griffith.*)

Mr. PEEL said, he objected to the Motion partly because some of the information it asked for was already in possession of the House, and partly because the information itself could be of no interest or value whatever. As to the amount of the balance of the Vote remaining unexpended, the hon. Gentleman would find that in the Finance Accounts, which stated the amount of the Secret Service money which remained unissued in the Exchequer year by year. If the other information asked for by the return were given, it would afford no insight into the application of the money, which he presumed was the only point which the hon. Gentleman would consider of interest or importance. Only one of two courses could be consistently pursued with regard to the Vote—either its distribution must remain secret or it must be done away with altogether. With regard to its application, there was the security of the declaration of the Secretary of State that it was applied in the manner in which the law intended it should be. He did not know how any improvement could be made in the checks now provided for the proper application of the money. The law which regulated the subject was passed in 1782. Its provisions were draughted by Burke himself in his Bill for the better regulation of the Civil List expenditure, and in his speech on economical reform he had explained the principles by which he had been guided. If the House was not satisfied with the personal declaration of the Secretary of State as to the application of the money it ought to refuse the Vote when it was proposed in Committee of Supply; but to the hon. Member's Motion, which would effect no manner of result either way, he must decidedly object.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH asked, who had the disposal of the greater part of the money? [Mr. F. Peel: The Foreign Minister.] The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was a piece of Ministerial sophistry. It was absurd to compare the present times with the stirring and contentious period of 1782. He would most certainly divide the House.

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 18; Noes 45: Majority 27.

SALMON FISHERY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 220.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause 31 (Order for Entry of Water Bailiff on Land).

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK objected to the wording of the clause as of too stringent a character, and moved that twenty-four hours' imprisonment be substituted for seven days.

Mr. LONGFIELD hoped the House would not agree to the Amendment, as he thought it most desirable that there should be a uniformity of legislation for England and Ireland.

Mr. T. G. BARING offered to insert "three days."

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK accepted that Amendment, and withdrew his Motion.

Clause amended and *agreed to.*

Clause *added*; Amendments made.

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

TURNPIKE TOLLS ABOLITION BILL.

[Bill 128.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. WHALLEY, in rising to move the second reading of the Bill, said he was aware that the repeated postponements which had taken place had greatly interfered with its prospects of becoming law this Session. The Bill had been prepared with great care, and he believed would meet a great and acknowledged evil at present existing. He wished to know what were the intentions of the Government in respect of this subject.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

Sir GEORGE GREY gave the hon. Gentleman credit for the pains he had taken in this matter, but, as it was impossible at this period of the Session to pass the Bill, the hon. Gentleman would do well to withdraw it now, and he hoped he would have an opportunity of introducing it again in the ensuing Session.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Order for Second Reading read and *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES ACT (1864) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 37.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. WHALLEY rose to move the second reading of this Bill, which he said was intended to get rid of a clause that had been surreptitiously introduced into a Bill which passed last year. That Bill was the meagre result of the labours of a Committee which sat nearly half of last Session. One conclusion at which the Committee arrived was that new projects for railways should not be resisted on the ground of competition. That Resolution was rescinded after a great part of the Report had been agreed to. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson) brought in a Bill during the last Session of Parliament for the purpose of relieving the public of the enormous difficulties and impediments which attended the prosecution of this branch of commercial enterprise, and that measure provided that if any landowners agreed in making a railway through their estates they should not be compelled to incur the inconvenience and expense attending the ordinary passage of railway Bills through both Houses of Parliament. Though this proposal was a very moderate one, the associated railway companies insisted, in case of their feeling themselves aggrieved by the construction of any proposed railway, that the Bills should pass through Parliament in the ordinary way and that the Board of Trade should be divested of its powers, and the right hon. Gentleman was compelled to insert a clause to this effect, contrary to his own better judgment. This clause he now proposed to repeal.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Whalley.*)

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, that though the clause to which the Bill of the hon. Member referred was inserted in the original measure against his wish, certain opposition to the progress of the Bill was withdrawn in consequence its insertion. This fact, coupled with the circumstance that there had been but little time to test the utility of the measure, compelled him to decline to give his support to the Motion of the hon. Member.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Order for Second Reading read, and *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT (1856) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 219.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. SCULLY thought that the measure had been pressed on with undue, if not indecent, haste, and hoped that some assurance would, at all events, be given that it would not in future years be treated in so hurried a manner.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Printed Copies of every Proclamation, &c., to be issued under last-mentioned Act).

Mr. SCULLY was of opinion that the original Act was sufficiently stringent in its provisions without the Amendments proposed in the present Bill.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, that a few technical alterations only had been made in the wording of the clauses.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1856, as amended by this Act, continued).

Mr. ESMONDE moved, as an Amendment, to leave out all the words after "sixty-six" to the end of the clause, in order to limit the duration of the Act to July, 1866.

Amendment proposed, in line 33, to leave out the words "and until the end of the then next Session of Parliament."—(*Mr. Esmonde.*)

MR. SCULLY thought, it would be better to substitute May for July, the former being the period when the Mutiny Act expired. The discussion upon the Bill must then come on at an earlier period of the Session.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, that the Bill was only for two years. He denied that it had been passed through in any unusual manner.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that this Bill by no means stood upon the same footing as the Mutiny Bill. That was virtually a permanent Act, which, he trusted, the present measure was not.

Question put, "That those words stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 32; Noes 17: Majority 15.

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment, to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

COLONIAL DOCKS LOANS BILL.

[BILL 226.] SECOND READING.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the second time."—(*Lord Clarence Paget.*)

MR. HENLEY asked for some explanation of its object.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, the Bill was brought in upon the recommendation of a Committee; and it was proposed that a maximum sum of £300,000 should be appropriated in the manner indicated in the Bill. The principle had been tried with success in Hong Kong, and it was now intended to extend it to other colonies. It was hoped that by means of the Bill our ships would be provided with docks in our colonies.

MR. HENLEY said, there seemed to be no security provided in the Bill that the docks should be made. He hoped that matter would be attended to in Committee.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Mr. Esmonde

WAYS AND MEANS.

Order for Committee read.

Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented 8th June] *referred.*

WAYS AND MEANS *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved,* That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there be issued and applied to the service of the year ending the 31st day of March 1866, the sum of £1,318,526 16*s.* 9*d.*, being the Surplus of Ways and Means granted for the service of preceding years.

2. That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the sum of £23,342,558 3*s.* 3*d.*, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

EXCISE ACTS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, upon the delivery for home consumption of any British compounded spirits which may be warehoused in any Customs or Excise warehouse upon Drawback, there shall be paid for and in respect of and in addition to every one hundred pounds of the Excise Duty payable thereon the same rates as are directed by the 15th section of the Act passed in the 23rd year of the reign of Her Majesty, chapter 22 (as construed and explained by the 5th section of the Act passed in the 23rd and 24th years of the same reign, chapter 36), to be paid for every one hundred pounds of Customs Duty payable on goods (not being Tobacco or Sugar), delivered for home consumption from any Customs warehouse.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

BANK NOTES ISSUE (SCOTLAND).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to the issue of Bank Notes in Scotland.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BLACKBURN and Mr. STIRLING.

COMPOUND SPIRITS WAREHOUSING.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to permit the Warehousing of Compound Spirits.

Resolution *reported.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER and Mr. PEEL.

INNS OF COURT (*re-committed*) BILL.

[BILL 192.]

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 21, 1865.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Referees on Private Bill Committee (No. 393).
WAYS AND MEANS — Resolutions [June 20] *reported.*
PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions reported* — Excise Acts; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction [Judges' Salaries].
Ordered—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Indemnity; Expiring Laws Continuance.
First Reading — Bank Notes Issue (Scotland)* [232]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Compound Spirits Warehousing* [233]; Indemnity [234]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [235].
Second Reading — Educational and Charitable Institutions [97] and *committed* for this day three months.
Considered as amended—Ulster Canal Transfer* [211]; War Department Tramway (Devon)* [*Lords*] [204].
Third Reading — Parsonages* [*Lords*] [205]; National Gallery (Dublin)* [203]; Harwich Harbour* [214]; Carriers Act Amendment* [224]; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment [220]; Falmouth Borough* [200]; Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment* [219.]
Withdrawn — Grand Juries (Ireland)* [93]; Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)* [171]; Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment [54]; Merchant Shipping Disputes [90]; Bank Notes (Ireland) [124]; Railways Clauses [170].

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (IRELAND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 54.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BLAKE rose to move the second reading of this Bill. He said it was very simple in its character, and its provisions would, he thought, recommend themselves so much by their justice that it would be unnecessary for him to trespass upon the time of the House at any length. The hon. Member read several of the clauses of the Bill, and drew attention more particularly to the 7th and 12th clauses. The latter was to place the appointment of sheriffs in boroughs in the hands of the corporations, and the reason for the change was that under the present system sectarian and personal influences were unduly exercised. In the city of Waterford only two citizen Roman Catholics had held the office since the time of James I. It was true that some country gentlemen, Roman Catholics, had held the office, but it was generally held by Protestants, though unobjectionable persons; but the population numbered eight Roman Catholics to one. The Bill he did not expect would pass this year, but he hoped the Secretary of State for Ireland would, during the recess, do something to remedy the present defects of the former Municipal Corporation Acts, which the present Bill was intended to supply.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he had been in communication with the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney General for Ireland, with regard to the provisions of the Bill now under consideration, and he was bound to say that in its present shape it would not be in the power of the Government to give the hon. Member that assistance in passing the measure he required. He did not think the hon. Member had any intention of pressing the Bill at present, but merely wished to ventilate the question. With regard to Clause 7, a Bill had been proposed, and which had passed that House, by the right hon. Member for the county of Limerick (Mr. Monsell) secured, to a great extent, the object of that clause; and with reference to Clause 12, which proposed to take the appointment of high sheriff of corporate boroughs and counties from the Lord Lieutenant and transfer it to the corporate bodies, he was surprised that the hon. Member should wish to have such a change made, considering how much the corporations, both in England and Ireland, were influenced by the very feelings which the hon. Member had referred to; and which rendered it peculiarly desirable that these appointments should be made by some authority without the corporations. He had taken some pains to ascertain whether there was really any grievance in Waterford as to the appointment of sheriffs, and he held in his hand a Return of the going Judges of assize in the district in which Waterford was situated. Each of these Judges of assize was Roman Catholic, and it was well known that upon the recommendation of the Judges the Lord Lieutenant made the appointment to the office of sheriff. In 1861 a Protestant was returned to the Judge, and stood first on the list, and he was appointed. In 1862 a Roman Catholic was placed first on the list, but he declined; and a Protestant, who stood second, was appointed. The same thing occurred in 1860 and in 1863. He would ask was there any sectarian spirit evident in this? In 1864 and 1865 the shrievalty was offered to Roman Catholics and declined. He would therefore put it to the House whether there was any real hardship under such circumstances, or whether there was any real grievance to complain of. If Clauses 7 and 12 were removed from the Bill, it would be more likely to obtain the favourable consideration of the Government. The hon. Member might rest satisfied that if he could lay before the Government any case involving a real grievance, they would be happy to do all in their power to provide for it a remedy, and he trusted that, satisfied with that assurance, he would assent to the withdrawal of a Bill so crudely framed that it was not desirable it should pass into a law.

Mr. VANCE said, he had come down to the House with the intention of opposing the Bill, and was glad there was a prospect that he would be spared the trouble of entering into any lengthened argument with that object. The provisions of the Bill would affect, not only Waterford, but other cities in Ireland, and, among them, Dublin, whose interests would be prejudiced by the proposed transference of the power of appointing so responsible an officer as a sheriff from the Government to the corporation. Hitherto, as a matter of fact, the most eminent citizens of Dublin had been chosen to fill that office without any distinction of creed or party.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Bill *withdrawn.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING DISPUTES BILL.

[BILL 90.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. DENMAN, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that the measure had been drawn up under the auspices of the Newcastle Chamber of Commerce, and had been approved at a large meeting of delegates from the Associated Chambers of Commerce throughout the country. That the subject with which it dealt was one of considerable interest and importance, was shown by the fact that a great many petitions in its favour had been presented from all our principal seaports, with the exception of London and Liverpool, which were not so active in the matter for the good reason that the former possessed a Court of Admiralty which transacted a good deal of business in the way of the settlement of shipping disputes, while the latter also had a court presided over by a most able Judge skilled in mercantile law, by whom those disputes were decided. He had, he might add, received a number of letters on the subject, one or two extracts from which would fully explain the nature of the grievance of which the mercantile shipping interest complained, and for which, by the Bill, it was sought to provide a remedy. In a statement which had been forwarded to him by a considerable shipping firm in Newcastle, they described the decisions of the present courts for the settlement of shipping disputes as being so unsatisfactory, and the cost of the proceedings before them so enormous, that many persons preferred submitting to any amount of injustice rather than bring or defend such actions as the law now stood; referring, in illustration of their statement, to an instance which had come under their own observation in which the question of the damage done to a particular vessel might originally have been settled for £6, had ended, after considerable litigation, in the ship having been sold for £600 and £700, which amount had, no doubt, been completely absorbed in costs. He had also a communication from a firm of eminent ship and insurance brokers in London, in which they said that a constantly increasing number of shipping disputes was being settled by unprofessional persons, owing to the difficulties and expense connected with the present system. Many persons, they went on to state, who suffered injury quietly bore their loss rather than make any attempt to obtain redress. The existence of such a state of things was naturally looked upon by the shipping interest as a grievance, while they also complained that the Judges by whom the mercantile law of the country was administered were apt very often to pronounce a decision upon written documents, acting upon their own view of the provisions which those documents contained, without any special knowledge of mercantile terms or usages. The subject, no doubt, was difficult to deal with; but he could not accept any discredit for having brought forward this measure at so late a period of the Session; for he had put down the second reading on the notice paper several times, and had been twice counted out. It was not, therefore, his fault that the measure had not been pressed on the notice of the House earlier. Having stated the grievances which were felt in regard to this subject, he would briefly inform the House what the remedies for those grievances were which the Bill provided. It was, in the first place, proposed that the measure should be applied to certain districts into which for that purpose the country would be portioned out, and which should include our great shipping ports, and each of which should contain one or more County Court district. The Bill further provided that courts should be constituted in those districts, and that they should consist of one President and Assessors; the President to be appointed by the Lord Chancellor, and to be selected from persons holding the office of County Court Judge, Commissioner or Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy, or stipendiary magistrate. The Assessors might be persons in business as merchants, manufacturers, or shipowners, who would be chosen in rotation for the duty by the town council of the borough within which the sittings of the Court are appointed to be held. These Assessors it was not proposed by the Bill to remunerate, but then they would be allowed certain privileges—such as exemption from serving on juries—but he thought the office would be considered so highly honourable that there would be no difficulty in finding gentlemen to act gratuitously. The advantage of the selection of such a class of persons as Assessors would be that the Judge would have persons experienced in business in the district in which the dispute might happen to arise to assist him in construing the written documents to which he had already referred. There would be an appeal from the Courts constituted under the Bill in those cases in which the sum involved was above a certain amount; and the result of the operation of the measure, he believed, would be cheap and speedy decisions. He regretted that he had been unable to bring the Bill on for second reading at an earlier period of the Session. If he could have done so he should have moved that it should be referred to a Select Committee. As it was, he hoped he should hear from the Government that they were prepared to deal with the subject, and should for the present content himself with moving the second reading *pro formâ.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Denman.*)

MR. HEADLAM said, he could corroborate the statement of his hon. and learned Friend, that the Bill had originated with the Newcastle Chamber of Commerce, where the evils it sought to remedy were much felt, and had received the approval of the Associated Chambers of Commerce. Under all the circumstances of the case he hoped his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade would give his serious attention to the subject, with a view of remedying the evils complained of.

MR. MILNER GIBSON admitted that the subject was one which was deserving of the fullest consideration of the Board of Trade—he was also prepared to grant that it was important technical knowledge should be at the command of a Judge who had to come to a decision on cases in which such knowledge was requisite; but, then, he was not of opinion that the Judge ought necessarily to be a man who had followed the calling out of which such cases arose. The Assessors who were to be appointed under the Bill were, he found, to have votes; so that they would, to all intents and purposes, be Judges in a cause in which, independent of other considerations, they might, as manufacturers and traders chosen by the Town Council of the borough nearest to the place at which the Court sat, have a personal interest. This, he thought, involved a principle which could not be admitted. He had no doubt that there was under the present system great delay as well as expense in dealing with the cases which arose, and it was a question deserving of consideration whether a Judge of the Court of Admiralty should not go circuit, and be assisted by Assessors, rather than that novel local courts should be established. It would, for instance, hardly be desirable to refer for decision to a court in which shipowners might have a preponderating influence the question of wages; which could, he thought, be more satisfactorily dealt with by the magistrates on the spot.

Nor was he, he might add, quite sure that the parties to an action would be relieved to any great extent from expense under the operation of the Bill, inasmuch as it would almost invariably happen that whenever a collision between vessels occurred those interested in the subsequent proceedings would be found to be residing at a distance from the scene of the occurrence. If, however, his hon. and learned Friend would allow the matter to rest for the present Session he would undertake that it should receive, during the recess, the fullest consideration, and possibly the Government might be able to propose some satisfactory measure on the subject.

Mr. HENLEY thought the President of the Board of Trade had given very satisfactory reasons why the House should not proceed further with the measure. It was probable that owing to the extension of our shipping operations the number of disputes in question had considerably increased, and it was of course desirable that those disputes should be settled as expeditiously and as inexpensively as possible. He did not think, however, that the Court proposed by the Bill would form a satisfactory tribunal. The Court was to consist of a Judge and four or five gentlemen who were to act as his Assessors; but they were all to have an equal voice in deciding both questions of law and questions of fact. The sound principle was that the Judge should lay down the law, and the juries decide as to the fact. Nor did he think that the Admiralty Court was so very popular that the establishment of an unlimited number of small Admiralty Courts, as was proposed, would be regarded by the country in the light of a blessing. He was, however, glad that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade intended to turn his attention to the subject, for it was deserving of consideration whether local courts might not be constituted with power to deal with cases in which the amount involved was under £50. Many of them would probably be better settled by means of arbitration than by any other mode.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that though he should be disposed to support any measure which had for its object the localizing and cheapening actions in shipping cases, he regarded the tribunals which it was proposed under the Bill to constitute as altogether novel, combining together as they would the duties of Judge and jury. To the establishment of such tribunals, therefore, he would not give his assent, while he could assure his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Tiverton that the Government were anxious to afford every facility to meet the views of the promoters of the Bill.

Mr. J. B. MOORE said, he believed that the establishment of a speedy mode of settling those suits was extremely desirable, and he thought their thanks were due to the hon. and learned Gentleman who had introduced the Bill, although it might not be expedient to pass it in its present form.

Mr. CAVE said, there was no doubt that some such Bill as that was demanded by the mercantile and shipping community of this country. The measure might, he believed, be somewhat better framed, but it appeared to him that its principle was perfectly correct — namely, the principle that a mixed tribunal, consisting of both legal and commercial gentlemen, should be established for the settlement of these cases. He thought, however, that the Court should be presided over by a lawyer. Legal education was essential. He knew an instance of a practical man, as the term was, being arbitrator in a shipping case, and re-opening matters of fact which had been agreed upon on both sides. On the other hand there was as much hard swearing in shipping, especially in running down cases, as in horse cases, and the presence of nautical men as assessors with diagrams, who could cross-examine witnesses, as to the wind, tides, and tack the ships were on when the collision occurred, would be very useful. The Bill was crude and imperfect, but might be the precursor of a really useful measure.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

BANK NOTES (IRELAND) BILL.

[BILL 124.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, its object was twofold—to make Bank of England notes a legal tender in Ireland, and to do away with some restrictions which now injuriously affected banks of issue in the latter country. As things at present stood, the only legal tender in Ireland was gold, which produced inconvenience when the sum to be paid was large; and in the case of a pressure for money in Ireland gold had to be sent over from London.

Country banks in Ireland were obliged to pay all their issues in gold; while ever since 1834 a Bank of England note was a legal tender for a country bank in England. It was a monstrous thing that a Bank of England note, a legal tender at this side of the Channel, ceased to be so on crossing the water. It might be said that the same argument would apply to a bank of Ireland note. The bank of Ireland, however, was, in fact, a private bank, while the Bank of England had always been in close connection with the Government and had more of a national character, and everything which affected the Bank of England injuriously affected the whole commercial class of the Empire. Another reason for making a Bank of England note a legal tender in Ireland was that it would promote free trade in banking in that country, where the Bank of Ireland had not dealt liberally with the public or the other banks as regarded its powers of issue. The other object of the Bill was to remedy a grievance banks of issue in Ireland much complained of. As the law now stood, every bank note in Ireland was made payable at the place where it was issued, and the consequence was that considerable quantities of gold were kept lying idle in the local branches and the formation of branch banks was discouraged. He proposed that for the future bank notes should be made payable at the head office only, as in Scotland, of the bank which issued them. At the present stage of the Session it was hopeless to expect that the measure could pass. The Belfast Banking Company, however, had petitioned in favour of the principle contained in the Bill; the Royal Bank in Dublin passed a resolution in favour of it, and other establishments, though they had not taken any active steps, also looked on it with favour. After some further observations the hon. Member concluded by moving *pro formâ* the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it had been his fortune more than once in following his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) to admit the clearness of his views and the ability of his arguments. He must, however, dissent from his proposal that this Bill should be read, even *pro formâ*, a second time. He would not dwell upon the objection, undoubtedly applicable as a general rule, to every proposition that the House should commit itself in the abstract to views of legislation admittedly impossible to be carried into effect at the time; nor would he object to the Bill as an attempt at piecemeal legislation, for that was the characteristic of most of our financial measures. But there were many special considerations surrounding the main propositions of the Bill to which he should find it most difficult to give his assent. The Bill touched not only the question of currency, but also the question of legal tender, the most delicate and difficult, probably, of all the considerations connected with this extensive subject. In reference to this question he must say that the proposals of his hon. and learned Friend were altogether premature. There was, no doubt, a good deal of force in the argument, applicable to Scotland as well as to Ireland, that where there was a limitation upon the issue of notes, a limit practically, though indirectly, was imposed upon banking; but, supposing even that a new legal tender ought to be established in those parts of the kingdom, it would remain a question of very great importance, and one regarding which the House at present was totally disqualified from pronouncing any opinion, whether that new tender ought to be the English bank-note. The immediate consequence of establishing the £5 English note as a legal tender in Ireland would be that the action of the Bank of England would be carried into Ireland, both as an issuing and banking body. The Bank of England had not been consulted on that point; but, as far as his opinion extended, it found ample responsibility and ample profit in discharging the very weighty and multifarious duties attaching to it in its present sphere. If he might venture to anticipate the decision of the Bank, it would pause before it accepted such a new responsibility; for this was plain—that wherever the Bank of England note went the Bank must establish agencies at which the note could be cashed, otherwise the very note by law made a legal tender would at once be at a discount. His hon. and learned Friend seemed to think that the measure would be of advantage to the Bank of England, inasmuch as it would tend to prevent a drain of gold from the Bank to Ireland. But the Bank of England did not care whether it paid in notes or gold, its power of meeting all its issues being amply provided for. Although the Government were far from paying absolute deference on such a point to the views of the Bank of Ireland, it was fair to remember that the Bank of Ireland objected to this measure; and a great deal of consideration would be requisite before it could ever be adopted. Her Majesty's Government did not deny that there were various points connected with the currency in Ireland rendering it a subject deserving of attention, but the present was not a convenient or proper time for asking the House to affirm a general principle such as that laid down in the Bill.

Mr. VANCE said, that however ingenious might be the proposals contained in the Bill, or the arguments put forward in its support, he could not regard as a patriotic proposal the suggestion that a great corporation like the Bank of England should be brought across to Ireland and encouraged to enter into competition throughout the country with all the native banks. This very subject of legalizing the tender of a Bank of England note had been brought under the consideration of the Select Committee of 1858, composed of many of the most eminent and experienced men of the day, with whom he had enjoyed the honour of being associated, and the unanimous opinion of that Committee was opposed to taking any action in the matter. The directors of the Bank of Ireland were examined before that Committee, and they simply proposed that their notes should be made a legal tender in Ireland. The late Sir George Cornewall Lewis thought, under the circumstances, that was a reasonable proposition; but such an enactment had never been proposed. No practical inconvenience resulted from the present arrangement, for the rate of exchange, once very high, had fallen to a point only equalling what would be requisite to cover the transmission of gold between the two countries. The question was one that, if taken up at all, ought to be left in the hands of the Government, and the hon. and learned Baronet, he thought, would act wisely in withdrawing the Bill.

Lord FERMOY thought that at this period of the Session it was futile to discuss this important question. He was, however, glad to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer admit that the whole banking system of Ireland was in an unsatisfactory state. In Ireland there was a great desire to develope the agricultural resources of the country; but it was impossible to do this without the aid of a liberal and sound system of banking. Now, the banking system in Ireland was of the very opposite character. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would turn his powerful intellect to that question with the view of altering the law relating to it. He trusted that before long the whole law of Ireland would be revised.

Mr. BLACKBURN was also glad to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that the present banking systems both in Scotland and Ireland were in some respects unsatisfactory. He (Mr. Blackburn) had brought in a Bill last night upon the subject as regarded Scotland, but without the slightest hopes of its passing into a law. The general feeling appeared to be in favour of free trade in banking. He trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would devise an effectual remedy for the evils complained of.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

EDUCATIONAL AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS BILL—[Bill 97.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. LYGON, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said, that he had introduced the measure at a much earlier period of the Session, but this was the first opportunity that had presented itself of moving the second reading. The measure dealt expressly with institutions connected with the Church of England, and Nonconformists were not intended in any way to be affected by its provisions. If it could be shown that their interests were touched in any way by the Bill, he would most willingly consent to any alteration of the measure that would remove all doubts on that point. A Bill was introduced last Session to afford facilities for Divine service in collegiate schools; but the measure now proposed was much larger in its scope, and much more satisfactory. Under the parochial system, as at present existing, it was impossible for any clergyman to perform Divine service in any part of a parish without the consent of the incumbent; and hence it followed that the incumbent had the option of prohibiting the performance of Divine service in any institution within that parish. The possible mischiefs which the Bill was intended to remedy had not occurred in many places, though in some quarters they had arisen; and it was most desirable that Parliament should interfere before they became at all serious. Nobody who was at all conversant with the discipline and management of such schools as Harrow, Rugby, or of the proprietary colleges formed in different parts of England, could deny that it was desirable for them to have chaplains of their own, unfettered by the responsibilities resting on those charged with the spiritual superintendence of the parish. The experience of the late Dr. Arnold abundantly established how valuable an adjunct the private chapel was to the beneficial influences of the school; and his view had been confirmed by that of almost every other head master. There were institutions also, besides schools, such as almshouses, penitentiaries, and others of a charitable nature, to which similar considerations applied; and of those, therefore, cognizance was taken by the present Bill, which proposed, instead of leaving the chaplain subject to the authority or caprice of the incumbent of the parish, to place him directly under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese, to whom, and to whom alone, he would then be responsible. For the parochial system he entertained the deepest respect, and he never would do anything to weaken the practical working of the system; but the Bill, so far from interfering with the system, only legitimately extended it. All this Bill contemplated, as the House would see, was that institutions of the nature indicated, when a chapel connected with them was licensed, should be withdrawn from the parochial authority, and made, as it were, an ecclesiastical district under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishop. The Church Building Acts contained a provision authorizing, under certain circumstances, a district to be formed even without the consent of the incumbent. That, however, was an extreme course, which he did not propose to adopt. His proposal was that when the trustees of an existing institution applied to the bishop, stating the nature of the institution and the circumstances under which the chaplain was to be appointed, the bishop, if he thought fit, and not otherwise, might issue his licence, whereupon for all the purposes mentioned in Clause 3; namely, the cure of souls within the institution, the sole right of preaching, performing Divine service, and administering the Holy Communion—the institution would become an ecclesiastical district. He had received many communications from heads of Colleges and others in positions of authority in favour of this Bill; and the advantages of putting an end to the uncertainty entailed by changes of incumbents must be obvious, bearing in mind that though one incumbent might consent to the performance of Divine service in an institution within the parish, his opinions were in no way binding on his successor.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Lygon.*)

MR. REMINGTON MILLS, in moving an Amendment that the Bill be read a second time on that day three months, said, the speech of the hon. Gentleman had not satisfied him that the Bill ought to receive the sanction of the House. He admitted that the provisions of the present Bill were different from those of last year, but the object appeared to be the same—namely, that these schools should be under the control of bishops of the Church of England. The classical and mathematical education given in many of these schools was open to pupils of all persuasions; but if they were compelled to attend religious service on the Lord's Day the children of Dissenters would be deprived of the advantage of attending these schools. In many of these schools the boys were not sufficient to form a congregation, and it would be very hard to deprive the master of the opportunity he now enjoyed of assisting clergymen in the neighbourhood in the performance of Divine service. In the greater portion of these schools the pupils lived in the town with their parents, and it was the duty of the parents to take them to their own places of worship. Nor could he see the advantage of compelling the children to attend a chapel in or connected with the school, with all its associations of the rod and tasks, &c. The Bill placed these chapels under the superintendence of the bishops, yet they were told that the bishops were overworked, and that a dozen new bishops would not be too many. A Commission had recently been appointed to inquire into these endowed schools, and it would be quite time to consider this subject when Parliament was called upon to legislate in regard to these schools. No one had petitioned for the Bill, and he begged to move, that it be read a second time that day three months.

MR. HADFIELD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Remington Mills.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. WALTER said, that as his name was on the back of the Bill he should like to state the views which had induced him to place it in so prominent a position. It appeared to him that his hon. Friend who had charge of this Bill, and the hon. Gentleman who opposed the second reading (Mr. Remington Mills), were acting on different grounds. So far as he was concerned, he had never contemplated the schools to which the hon. Member had just alluded. He considered this Bill as a prospective rather than a retrospective measure. He happened to know that a measure of this kind was required on principles of justice. It was well known that there was a great want at the present day of large public schools for the education of a class of persons who could not afford the expense of going to the large old educational establishments. Many benevolent persons had combined to establish schools of that character. Acting upon the denominational principle, which was the governing principle of education in England, they wished to connect their school with the religious denomination to which they belonged, and in the case contemplated by this Bill that denomination happened to be the Church of England. Take the case of persons wishing to found schools for 400 or 500 boys upon some site not within or near a town. They thought a country site best for the health of the boys; they bought the land cheap in a rural district and they founded a large institution. But the moment they began to build a chapel, or to provide for the religious services of the institution, the clergyman of the parish might step in, and control and upset their arrangements. He believed that the Wellington College was one of the most important institutions founded in modern times; yet the clergyman of the parish in which it was situated had the right to step in and interfere with the religious arrangements of the College. He, for one, did not desire to interfere with the *status quo* of the old endowed schools of the country, nor with the various interests which had grown up around them. But with respect to schools of the kind to which he had alluded, he thought that the circumstances of the case called for legislation; and, as his hon. Friend had justly pointed out, although it was possible that the particular incumbent of the parish might work harmoniously with the chaplain or master of these institutions, yet it was equally possible that his successor might hold different views and might raise formal objections to the religious services of the institution. It was essentially necessary that some provision for the religious services of such large schools should be made, for the parish church might not afford the requisite accommodation. A new church would be necessary, and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. R. Mills) would not be in favour of building it by means of a church rate. Church accommodation, however, of some kind the pupils of such an institution must have, and how were they to get it except by machinery of this description? But did the hon. Gentleman think that every clergyman of a parish—that any haphazard incumbent, who might perhaps be seventy years of age—was a fit person to administer religious instruction to 500 boys? Clearly not, and the hon. Gentleman would be the last person to make such an assertion. He was sure that if a Dissenting College were to be established the hon. Gentleman would be the first person to demand that adequate means should be afforded, such as were provided by the Bill for the religious instruction of members of the Established Church. He asked for nothing more for the Church than what the Dissenters would enjoy without question. The clergyman of the parish might be a very good man, but, on the other hand, he might be utterly unfit to have any control over an institution of this kind, and such institutions ought therefore to be looked upon as extra-parochial places and put under the charge of the Bishop of the diocese. With regard to the principle of the Bill, he could not see what objection could be raised to it. If the net included too many places within it, that was a matter open to objection and discussion. He should be sorry to disturb the *status quo* in respect to any school to which clergymen might now have access, or by which the claimants to the rights of a school would be interfered with. It was perhaps too late this Session to pass the measure, but he thought that the case of the institutions to which he had alluded required legislation upon the most ordinary principles of justice and common sense.

MR. HADFIELD said, that the Bill would place the chaplains of schools in a position of rivalry with the incumbents of the parish. The founder of these schools contemplated the teaching of the child, and not the appointment of the master as chaplain. The measure would create an empire within an empire. Why did not the hon. Member bring in the Bill at an earlier period of the Session? Last year the Bill came on for discussion in a similar manner at the fag end of the Session. Believing that the measure would violate the foundation deeds of charities and unsettle the rights of Dissenters in these schools, he supported the Amendment, and would cheerfully divide against the Bill.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, it was generally admitted it would be impossible to proceed with the Bill this Session, and that the only object in discussing it was that its principle should be fully understood, and thus the way prepared for future legislation. It appeared that some grievance had led to the introduction of this Bill, and it was one suffered by members of the Church of England, because they belonged to a State Church. In fact, in some respects they were more fettered than the Dissenting bodies. There was nothing to prevent Roman Catholics, Independents, Quakers, or Mormonites from establishing a school according to the religious principles of their respective persuasions—the law did not interfere. But if Churchmen established a school, it was possible for some legally authorized person to interfere with the religious teaching which the parents might wish to be given. He did not think that members of the Church of England should, on some consideration of "Church and State" policy, lose the liberty enjoyed by other persuasions, and he was favourable to the principle of the Bill so far as it granted that liberty. There was, however, a danger to be guarded against, and care must be taken that the rights of Dissenters should not be interfered with. It was not unnatural that the measure should be regarded with suspicion by the Dissenters. There were several educational establishments which their children had the right to attend, and others as to which their rights were in doubt or dispute. It was necessary that nothing should be done to weaken the present rights or claims of Dissenters, and such a measure, if brought forward at all, should be introduced by the Government. If it were now withdrawn, and the Secretary of State should take it up in another Session, he ought to see, on the one hand, that it was not advisable that parents of the Church of England should be deprived of the rights enjoyed by other sects, while, on the other hand, great care should be taken not to put the Nonconformists in a worse position than they now enjoyed.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he could not concur in the grounds on which the objections of his hon. Friend who moved the Amendment were founded, but he agreed that it would not be desirable to proceed further with the measure at the close of the Session. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lygon) explained that he had brought it in at an early period of the Session, but that he had not had an opportunity of asking the House to agree to the principle until the present time. If there really was a practical grievance, as stated by the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), he should be sorry to object to the application of any proper remedy. He understood it to be alleged that in public schools, such as Harrow, Rugby, and Wellington College, Divine service could not be performed by the master or any chaplain attached to the schools without the consent of the incumbent, and that this consent was not always given. His hon. Friend who spoke last (Mr. W. E. Forster), said that the Government ought to bring in a Bill next Session to remedy the grievance; but all he (Sir George Grey) could say was that not one word had ever been addressed to him as to the existence of any grievance or inconvenience of this kind. He was not aware of any practical difficulty in the performance of Divine service in such institutions. At Harrow he was sure there was none. Dr. Arnold continually performed Divine service in the school chapel of Rugby, and several volumes of most valuable sermons preached by him at Rugby had been published. He was not aware that the slighest difficulty had occurred at Rugby which this Bill would remove. If, however, there was any case of this kind—and he gathered from the speech of his hon. Friend that there was one such case—if the incumbent of any parish exercised any right which he might possess of refusing his licence to a clergyman to officiate in a public school, that might be a reason for an alteration of the law. But the present measure went much beyond that. It included within its provisions every endowed school in England connected by its foundation with the Church of England. It would, therefore, include almost all the great grammar schools of the country. He had received a letter that day from a gentleman in one of the northern dioceses, stating, that the Bill would apply to 148 schools in that diocese, and would therefore virtually enable the Bishop to interfere with 148 parishes within his diocese. Why did the hon. Gentleman who proposed this Bill go so much beyond the object he had in view, and thus excite so much more opposition than a more limited measure would receive? It was stated that many of these endowed schools, although connected by their foundation with the Church of England, were attended very largely by Dissenters; and it must not be forgotten that the exercise of the powers conferred by this Bill would have the effect, or might have the effect, if attendance at Divine service should be enforced, of causing the children of Nonconformists to be withdrawn. He did not object to the principle of the Bill as it had been explained by his hon. Friend the Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walters), but he could not help thinking that the measure deserved more consideration than could be given to it at the present period of the Session. He suggested last year, on a similar occasion, that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, and he stated that if the hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill would consent to that course, he would support the second reading. He was ready to make the same offer on the present occasion. What the House wanted to know was the particular nature and extent of the grievance complained of, and then apply the remedy without going beyond the necessities of the case. Last year the hon. Member for Knaresborough (Mr. Collins), who had charge of the Bill, admitted the reasonableness of his proposal. If the hon. Member (Mr. Lygon) went to a division, he was ready to vote for the second reading, on the understanding that the measure was not to be proceeded with this Session, and that if it were again introduced next Session it should be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. COLLINS would recommend his hon. Friend to adopt the proposal of the Home Secretary, because, although there appeared to be an almost unanimous feeling that something ought to be done, yet it was impossible the Bill could be properly considered this Session. Wellington College was not the only instance in which a Bill of this kind was required. There was a school containing some 500 boys at Lancefield, and were they to be compelled to go to the parish church? In some cases the church only contained accommodation for 200 or 250 persons altogether; and were the parents to be at the mercy of the incumbent to say whether there should be a chapel attached to the school or not? Some legislation was wanted, but as soon as any measure was brought in to benefit the Church of England the hon. Member for Sheffield appeared to consider it his duty to thwart it.

Mr. LYGON said, he was willing to accept the proposal of the Home Secretary. The reason why the measure had been deferred to so late a period of the Session was that he had been anxious to obtain the co-operation of the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter). His hon. Friend took some time to consider the matter, and that was the reason why he had not been able sooner to proceed with the Bill which he had laid on the table in February. He was glad to hear so general an admission of the necessity of some legislation on this subject.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 35: Majority 14.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for this day three months.

RAILWAYS CLAUSES (*re-committed*) BILL.

[BILL 170.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. BASS said, that this was the second Bill on the same subject, and a great many of the clauses which were of advantage to the public in the former Bill were not to be found in this. Now, the subject was one which required much more consideration than it was possible to give it at this period of the Session. Clause 10 in the former Bill, which related to taking possession of shops and dwelling-houses, provided that the companies should give six months' notice beforehand; but the railway magnates had succeeded in getting this clause struck out. Again, Clause 14 of the old Bill gave compensation for loss of trade—and assuredly there could not be a fairer ground for compensation—and yet that clause had been struck out. In Clause 21 of the first Bill restrictions were imposed upon the creation of impediments to traffic; but the railway companies induced the right hon. Gentleman to strike out that provision also. Clause 22 of the other Bill provided that the companies should not stop up a street without the consent of the street authorities, and in a previous clause it was laid down that a portion of the street should be left open for traffic; but both clauses had been cut out. The fact was the railway companies at present had it all their own way. What with contractors in the House and railway directors at the right hon. Gentleman's back, those companies were a very powerful body. For similar goods and similar quantities of them it would be thought that the same rates should be charged; but that was not always the case even on different parts of the same line. Some railways charged only half what was charged by others. He could give an instance with regard to one trade, in which the difference of rates made a difference of £50,000 a year. This Bill was too important to pass in so thin a House and at such a late period of the Session, and he should therefore move that it be re-committed this day month.

LORD FERMOY seconded the Amendment. Their constituents out of doors had reason to complain of the way in which the President of the Board of Trade had dealt with the Bill. The Bill had been subjected to so many alterations that it was to all intents and purposes a new one. The parishes of St. Pancras and Marylebone had, of all others in the metropolis, been most invaded by the railway companies, and no one except those who were intimately connected with the traders of the metropolis could form an idea of the absolute ruin which was caused by those companies running a line through a populous district. He had known many excellent and industrious tradesmen in St. Pancras and Marylebone utterly ruined in consequence of the railway companies cutting off customers from getting access to their shops. The conduct of the Government with regard to this Bill had been something very like underhand dealing with the House, and he should give every possible opposition to the Bill unless his right hon. Friend consented to reintroduce the compensation clause which was contained in the former Bill.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Bass,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HORSFALL said, he should feel it his duty to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Derby. The Bill professed to give the public protection against the railway companies; but he held in his hand a circular which would put an end to that delusion. That circular, which was signed with the name of Mr. Thomas Coates, stated that the Parliamentary Committee of the railway companies had discussed the provisions of the Bill with the Board of Trade, and those provisions were now in harmony with the views of the railway companies. Of course they were; for the clauses in favour of the public had been struck out. It was said that this was merely a Bill for the consolidation of previous enactments, and yet the Amendment which he had proposed to introduce would not be accepted by the right hon. Gentleman, though the provision which the Amendment embodied had been inserted in a former Bill. In the North Staffordshire Bill a clause had been inserted which subjected railway terminal charges to arbitration, and that was the very principle of the clause which he proposed to introduce as an Amendment. That was the sum total of the protection which he proposed to give the public, and yet the right hon. Gentleman had taken exception to it. In cases of difference, who was to decide under the Bill proposed by the right hon. Gentleman? None but the railway companies. But let hon. Members picture to themselves a trader taking a case into Court against railway companies with their millions of capital. What, then, could be fairer than to adopt the principle of the North Staffordshire Bill, and to have arbitrators appointed? Such a protection was absolutely necessary to the public. If his hon. Friend would consent to insert a clause to that effect he should be disposed to support the Bill; but the Bill in its present shape was injurious to the public and iniquitous, and he should oppose it.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, the inhabitants of the metropolis had the greatest possible reason to complain of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman. Several Bills had been withdrawn to-day on the ground that it was too late in the Session to pass them, and that was the course which ought to have been pursued with regard to the present Bill; but the right hon. Gentleman had allowed himself to be overpersuaded by the railway directors who were now sitting behind him. The Metropolitan Underground Railway was calculated to supply a grievous want, but it also brought to light a grievous want, and that was, a want of proper legislation for railways running through the metropolis. His noble Colleague (Lord Fermoy) had stated that he knew several instances of persons who had been ruined by the construction of the metropolitan railways. The law was, that persons injuriously affected might obtain damages against the companies, and many persons proceeded against them in the Sheriff's Court and had been awarded damages, which in some cases the companies paid. But at last the railway authorities took heart of grace and appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench; and the Court decided that the judgment of the Sheriffs' Court was right. The railway companies upon this appealed from that decision to the Court of Error, and there it was decided that a person might be injuriously affected without being wronged. And now the law was, in such a case, that persons not having money could not obtain compensation because they could not go to the House of Lords. One would have thought that to Clauses 21 and 22 of the former Bill there could have been no reasonable objection; and yet these clauses had been struck out, through what occult influences he would leave it to the House to imagine. He had himself presented a petition in favour of these clauses, and especially of the compensation clause. They were told that the Bill contained nothing new, and, therefore, they ought to pass it as a matter of course. But if there was nothing in the Bill but what was law at present, then let the law remain as it was until next Session; and let nothing be introduced by a side wind. If the Bill should go into Committee, which he hoped would not be the case, he should ask leave to introduce a clause which, he believed, had emanated from the Vice President of the Board of Trade, and which was contained in the original Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman, to whose special care they must look in matters of this kind, had deliberately adopted certain clauses, was the House to submit to have them struck out at the dictation of railway companies? If the clauses were wrong why introduce them into the original Bill? If right, why strike them out?

MR. M'MAHON said, that in the course of last Session a Bill was introduced for the purpose of limiting the amount of compensation to first-class railway passengers to the small sum of £300. The whole power of the railway interest was brought to bear in support of that Bill. [MR. MILNER GIBSON: No!] The right hon. Gentleman must know what influences were brought to bear better than he could, but at all events the Bill was favourable to the railway interests. That Bill was thoroughly considered by the House, and thrown out by a very large majority. Now, it so happened that in one of the Railway Bills passed last Session a clause was smuggled through the House limiting the compensation for killing a mechanic to— what sum did the House think? What was the value of a mechanic's life in the opinion of railway directors? [An hon. MEMBER: No; of the Board of Trade.] Well, it might be the opinion of the Board of Trade too. The clause to which he referred was in the Bill of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway—and he mentioned the circumstance because the right hon. Gentleman said there was nothing new in the Bill. Now, he would ask, was there any general railway Act in force applying to England, Ireland, and Scotland in which the compensation for killing a mechanic was reduced to £100? And not only was the compensation not to exceed £100, but the amount to be awarded was to be determined by an arbitrator appointed by the Board of Trade, and not otherwise. Now, in a Christian country to introduce such a clause was the most wicked thing he ever heard of. Cicero mentioned that it was one of the moot questions of his day whether in a storm one should throw overboard a cheap slave or a dear horse. Well, he supposed the right hon. Gentleman had been considering that question. In the Canal Navigation Act the limit of compensation for the loss of a horse was £50. Assuredly a valuable horse ought in the estimation of the right hon. Gentleman to rank with a mechanic, and therefore they had better reduce the compensation for a mechanic's life to £50. Such a clause as that to which he had referred would alone be enough to show that this Bill had been clearly introduced in the interest of the railway companies. Hon. Members might be sure that the interest of those companies had been consulted to the detriment of the public.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, there was clearly some misapprehension as to the nature and objects of this Bill. He was charged with having been advised by the railway companies and the various parties interested in order to determine what clauses the Bill should contain. Of course it was right, as far as it could be done, to consult all parties interested, so as to know what they had to urge. But in this case it happened that the only advisers he had were the Acts of Parliament and the decisions of that House. The object of the Bill was to condense and settle the clauses which had been sanctioned by Committees on Private Bills, and which were of such a character that it was thought safe and proper to incorporate them in a general Act, so as to save Parliament the trouble of repeatedly enacting the same thing. His hon. Friend objected to the Bill because it did not contain a great many provisions which would be for the public advantage. He was quite ready to admit that changes had been made in the Bill since it was first introduced. And why? Because it was found after some consideration that clauses had been introduced which it was believed had not been sufficiently sanctioned by Parliament to justify their incorporation in all future Acts. The clause in which the Marylebone vestry took such great interest had been introduced into only one metropolitan railway Act, and in consequence of which the company concerned gave up the line altogether, because the compensations would be so excessive that it was out of the question to think of making it. The Board of Trade, therefore, did not consider themselves justified in introducing that clause, seeing that it had had the sanction of Parliament only in one particular Bill. He accepted the doctrine that every person should be protected from injustice, but the present law was supposed sufficient to do that. ["No, no!"] Parliament at least had thought so. Now, so far from the Bill having been framed in the interest of the railway companies, he had received a deputation representing the railway interest, which had asked him not to proceed with the Bill. The Bill had been introduced in the public interest, and not in that of the railway companies, and he thought it would be acceptable to the House. The hon. Member for Liverpool proposed to introduce a new clause. [Mr. HORSFALL: It has been introduced already in another Bill.] It was new matter as far as the object of the Bill before the House was concerned. It was true it had been introduced in one Bill; but that was not enough. The Government did not propose to put into this Bill every clause that had ever been introduced in a private Bill, but only such as had unmistakeably received the sanction of Parliament. The Bill was intended to re-enact such clauses only as Parliament had affirmed over and over again. There might be errors in the Bill, but those errors might be corrected in Committee; but if it was to be opposed at this period of the Session, clause by clause, he quite admitted that that was an argument against going on with the Bill. He did not wish to take anyone by surprise, but the measure was not volunteered by the Board of Trade. It was in consequence of a recommendation of a joint Committee of the Lords and Commons, which sat in the beginning of last Session, that the Bill was brought in. That Committee considered the question of metropolitan railways, and they recommended that as soon as practicable a Bill should be introduced, containing such clauses as had received the sanction and approval of Parliament, and which should apply to all future Bills. If, however, the feeling of the House was that it was too late in the Session to carry such a Bill, he would not stand in the way. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Horsfall) wanted the House precipitately to enact without inquiry, as a permanent clause for the government of all future railways, a new clause somewhat similar to one once inserted in a private railway Act. This was a clause settling for the future the mode of assessing the terminal charges on railways. But the hon. Gentleman was the Member of a Commission appointed to inquire into that particular question. It was his duty to bring that subject under the consideration of the Commission, and recommend to Parliament what he thought right after inquiry by the Commission. But the hasty legislation which the hon. Member now asked for was not prudent or justifiable. He (Mr. Milner Gibson) did not wish to prolong the Session unnecessarily. By not passing this Bill the question would be left where it was, and hon. Gentlemen must be held responsible for declining to protect the public interests covered by the Bill. He would ask leave of the House to withdraw the Motion.

Mr. HENLEY said, he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman would follow the course which all his Colleagues had recommended should be taken with every measure that had come before them to-day; and therein the right hon. Gentleman was acting with great discretion. But the right hon. Gentleman would allow him (Mr. Henley) to call his attention to this point. The House had been informed that, as regarded the framing of this Bill the right hon. Gentleman had held no consultation with anybody, but had framed his measure by taking those clauses which were usually found in railway Acts.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON denied having said that he had had no communication with the railway authorities in respect to this measure. He had certainly intended to say the very reverse.

Mr. HENLEY repeated, that the right hon. Gentleman had stated that his measure was framed on those clauses that were usually found in railway Acts. How was it, then, that every provision that operated as a protection to the public had been struck out of the Bill by the right hon. Gentleman's own hand? As the Bill originally stood there were five or six provisions which gave some protection to the public; but they were now gone. Now, it was the duty of the Government, in introducing model clauses, to take care to introduce those which protected the public; the railway interest was quite capable of looking after itself. The title of the Bill as amended, was, "A Bill for consolidating in one Act provisions frequently inserted in acts relating to Metropolitan and other railways." But these words should have been added, "and to give further power to certain public bodies in the metropolis to obstruct improvement, and enable railway companies further to oppress the public." He was thankful that the measure was to go along with all the other Bills already discharged, and that hon. Members would have the chance of getting away sooner.

Mr. AYRTON said, the right hon. Gentleman had given no explanation of the allusion made by the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. M'Mahon) to the valuation of a mechanic's life at £100 in certain cases of railway accident. Now, the clause in question was really of extreme benefit to the working classes. Whereas the railway companies had power to charge at the rate of 1*d.* a mile, the London, Chatham, and Dover offered to carry working men at certain times of the day at the rate of one penny per journey, upon condition that the responsibility of the company should be limited in case of railway accident, and the maximum payment should not exceed £100. He saw nothing in this arrangement but what was highly beneficial to the working man.

Colonel DUNNE could not see the advantage to the working classes from such an arrangement, and asked what Parliamentary sanction had been given to this valuation of a working man's life at £100?

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

SALMON FISHERY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 220.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Mr. LAWSON asked, Whether there was any intention on the part of the Government to alter the law respecting the Solway, as to which there was considerable uncertainty?

Mr. PEEL said, the Lord Advocate intended early next Session to introduce a Bill making the law on that point quite clear.

Bill read 3° and *passed.*

INDEMNITY BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Mr. PEEL moved for leave to introduce a Bill to indemnify such persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and to extend the time limited for these purposes accordingly.

Mr. HADFIELD asked, Whether it was a dignified course for the House to pass every year these indemnity Bills? He believed that if the Government had taken up a measure for abolishing the old qualification such a measure would have passed the Upper House; but the Bill he had submitted had been rejected by the other House of Parliament for the sixth time, for no other reason, that he could conceive, except to punish the humble individual who had charge of the Bill.

Mr. PEEL said, the object of the Bill he was now introducing was not only to grant indemnity to those officials who had not taken the declaration required by the Act of George IV., but also to grant it to those who had not taken the consolidated oath now imposed in lieu of the former oath of allegiance and abjuration. The Bill of the hon. Gentleman had reference exclusively to the declaration under the Act of George IV., and even if passed it would not have dispensed with the necessity of this measure.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to indemnify such persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and to extend the time limited for those purposes respectively, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 234.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND APPROPRIATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dodson, Bill to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the year ending thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Peel.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE.

On Motion of Mr. Peel, Bill for continuing various expiring Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peel and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bill *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 235.]

COMPOUND SPIRITS WAREHOUSING BILL.

Bill "to allow British Compounded Spirits to be warehoused upon Drawback," *presented*, and read 1°. [Bill 233.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 22, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Rentcharges (Ireland) Revision* (203); National Gallery (Dublin)* (196); Harwich Harbour* (197); Carriers Act Amendment* (198); Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment* (199); Falmouth Borough* (201); Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment* (200).

Second Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expences)* (180); Malt Duty* (181); Harbours Transfer* (182); Trusts Administration (Scotland)* (185); Kingstown Harbour* (188); Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances)* (189).

Select Committee — Report — Public Schools* (32).

Committee — Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c. Amendment* (160); General Post Office (Additional Site)* (124); Admiralty Acts Repeal* (165); Admiralty Powers, &c.* (166); Dockyard Ports Regulation* (167); Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment (61).

Report—Public Schools* (32); Lunatic Asylum Act (1853) &c. Amendment* (160); Railway Debentures &c. Registry* (191); Locomotives on Roads* (164); Mortgage Debentures* (173); Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment* (106); Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment* (136); Procurators (Scotland)* (153).

Third Reading—Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment* (192); Trespass (Scotland)* (146); Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment* (125); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation)* (157); Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2)* (154); Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland)* (128); Colonial Laws Validity* (158); Colonial Marriages Validity* (159); Defence Act (1860) Amendment* (152).

SMALL BENEFICES (IRELAND) ACT (1860) AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 61.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee (according to Order).

The Earl of BELMORE, in moving to insert a new clause after Clause 2, said, that it was in harmony with the principle of the Bill, which was one to amend the Acts relating to the endowment of district parishes and building of churches, and that it was not objected to by the Most Rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Dublin). As the law now stood in any case where a district parish was formed out of two or more parishes, and the bishop, by the power he now possessed, compelled the incumbents of those parishes to contribute towards the endowment of the new parish, or in case it was made out of a portion of one parish, then the incumben of that parish, and they alone, had the patronage of the new incumbency in such order and with such number of turns each as the bishop might think fit. It might so happen, and indeed sometimes did happen, that the endowment was augmented by private persons in the form of subscriptions or donations, and the object of this Amendment was to provide that in the case of any person subscribing not less than £500, the bishop might, if he chose, give that person one or more turns in the nomination of the incumbent. As the clause was not objected to, he would, with this short explanation, move its insertion.

Motion *agreed to*; Clause inserted.

Amendment made; the Report thereof to be received *To-Morrow*; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 205.)

RENTCHARGES (IRELAND) REVISION BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to provide for the annual Variation of Rentcharges in lieu of Tithe in Ireland, and its Applotment in certain Cases—Was *presented* by The Lord Somerhill; read 1ª; and to be *printed*. (No. 203.)

House adjourned at Six o'clock,
till To-morow, half-past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, June 22, 1865.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Henry William Eaton, esquire, *for* Coventry.

Select Committee—*Report*—On Leeds Bankruptcy Court [No. 397]; Mines [No. 398]; Thames River [No. 399].

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Turnpike Acts Continuance.

Second Reading—Clerical Subscription [*Lords*] [199]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Indemnity [234]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [235]; Compound Spirits Warehousing* [233].

Committee—Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [133]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* (*re-comm.*) [228]; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction [*Lords*] [150]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* [209]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [225]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [227].

Report—Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [133]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* (*re-comm.*) [228]; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction [*Lords*] [150].

THE PAYMASTER GENERAL AND THE AUDIT OFFICE.—QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES DOUGLAS said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it be the system throughout the Civil Service that two persons are selected by the Treasury, in each office, to make out the List of Payments to be made, which Lists are sent to the Paymaster General, who pays them without question if signed by the officers duly appointed to sign, and the Audit Office passes the accounts (of some offices) in the accounts of the Paymaster General? Whether those officers in the several Departments do not substantially draw cheques on the Paymaster General, as the Treasury banker, which are honoured by him, and passed by the Audit Office as a matter of course? Who audits the accounts of the drawers of cheques? What securities are there against the drawing of cheques contrary to Treasury authority, and possibly not for the Public Service, or against fraud, except the integrity of the drawers of cheques? And is there any, and what, security for the discovery of fraud by an audit of the accounts in the account of the Paymaster General?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the Question of his hon. Friend did not permit of being answered in that House. It could only be answered by explanations in detail of all the arrangements connected with the drawing of money and the audit of accounts in all the Departments of the public service; and such an explanation, if given by word of mouth only, would not be intelligible to the House. He would, however, give his hon. Friend a partial answer. He should be happy to give him an opportunity of considering the subject more at large, leaving it to him to determine how far he would prosecute his investigations; for he could not imagine a more legitimate subject of inquiry than that with which his hon. Friend proposed to charge himself. He believed he should be right in saying that it was not the fact that any one system prevailed throughout the whole of the Civil Service. The payments, the accounts, the audits, of the different Departments, were differently regulated; in some cases by precise and stringent provisions of Acts of Parliament, and in others by the authority of the Department itself. In the case of the Navy, an Act of William IV. provided that an account should be made out, signed by the Accountant General of the Navy, and countersigned in the manner the Lords of the Admiralty should from time to time direct. In this instance, therefore, no question of selection by the Treasury could arise at all. In the same manner orders for the payment of money issued by the War Office were signed and countersigned; but in that case there must be the approval of the Treasury. Then the regulations of the Civil Departments varied from those of the Admiralty and the War Office, and the names of the officers who were charged with the responsibility of signing and countersigning were submitted for approval to the Treasury. Whether in all cases there were two, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) did not know, but he thought it very possible that this might be the general rule, and he saw nothing unreasonable in the plan so devised. Undoubtedly these officers would draw upon the Paymaster General, and their drafts would have the effect of cheques upon the Paymaster General. Then, his hon. Friend asked who audited the accounts, and also asked what security there was against fraud, except the integrity of the drawers? Well, the Departments had their regulations upon this subject, and the principal security against fraud or negligence was the use of a counter signature. That might be described to be the system in which all our payments were regulated; and he believed that in the main it was a good system. It was obvious that in any system of checks there must be an end to it somewhere, and somebody there must be from whose default of duty the public must suffer. There must be a limit to the multiplication of checks; and it should be borne in mind that increased security was by no means in proportion to the number of persons discharging their duty, or seeing that it was discharged by others.

NAVY—LOSS OF THE "BOMBAY."

QUESTION.

MR. OWEN STANLEY said, in rising to put the Questions, of which he had given notice, to the Secretary of the Admiralty in connection with the loss of the *Bombay*, he must preface them by stating that that vessel left Monte Video for practice, and having sailed about fifteen miles, she placed one target for that purpose. About 3.30 the fire-bell rang, the mainmast fell at 4.15, and the foremast went at 5.5; the magazine exploded about 8.25, and ninety-two souls perished, not by fire, but by drowning, out of a crew of 620 men, and two officers were lost, neither being able to swim. He held in his hand a copy of a letter written by Lieutenant Carr, who was in the vessel, and in which he said—

> "I am sure no man who could swim need have lost his life that day; those who could not were too stupified to help themselves. Though a deal of gear was thrown overboard that would have floated, many, many poor wretches (marines) I saw who could not swim jumping overboard, boots, coats, and all. I saw all this from the quarter-deck netting. Had the breeze been as strong as it was an hour before, half those saved would have been lost. Want of powers of swimming was the cause of their deaths. We had no men in their beds; luckily all the sick were saved, or rather saved themselves."

In the early part of the present year, he might add, twenty cadets of the mercantile marine were out sailing in the river, when the boat was upset, and ten of them were drowned. Under those circumstances, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If there was any special Report made to the Lords of the Admiralty by the Admiral of the station as to the loss of ninety-two Sailors and Marines from the burning of Her Majesty's ship *Bombay* off Monte Video, on the 14th of last December; if he can state the number of Marines and Sailors who were drowned separately, and the length of time that elapsed from the first breaking out of the fire to the sinking of the ship; if there were any patent Lifebelts on board; and, if so, if they were used? If there is any order, rule, or system in the Navy or the Marine Corps under which the recruits or men are taught to swim, and if the boys in the service are instructed in the art of swimming; and how many the crew of Her Majesty's ship *Bombay* were on the 14th of December?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET, in reply, stated that the cadets on board the *Worcester* were not under the control of the Admiralty, and that the death from drowning of the ten boys at Erith, however much it was to be regretted, could not be laid at the door of that Department. In answer to the questions which had reference to the loss of the *Bombay*, he had to inform the hon. Gentleman that the number of those who perished on that occasion amounted in all to ninety-one, including two officers, forty-seven seamen, eight boys, and thirty-four marines. On board all our training ships distinct orders were issued by the Admiralty to the effect that all the boys should be taught to swim. Occasionally it was reported that some boys were so nervous that they could not be taught, and it was curious that one of the boys who was drowned in the case of the *Bombay* was a boy who had been brought up on board the *Excellent,* but who could never learn the art of swimming. He would not trouble the House by entering into the details of the regulations on the subject which had been laid down by the Admiralty for the boys in our training ships as well as for recruits in the marine barracks, but he could assure the hon. Gentleman that they were very stringent, and that additional instructions had been issued that they should not be neglected. With regard to life-belts, various proposals had been made to the Admiralty, and had been tried. The men had in some instances been supplied with cork beds with the view of saving life in the event of the occurrence of any disaster, but it was found they objected altogether to the use of those beds. There were at present life-belts of a very simple construction in use in the Channel fleet on trial, and if the report of them was favourable they would be generally used. There were also life-belts at our Coastguard stations, and the usual life-buoys on board every ship. The total number of men on board the *Bombay* had been 641, of whom, as already stated, ninety-one were lost. The length of time between the discovery of the fire and the blowing up of the ship he found was exactly four hours and three quarters. He should be happy to give further information if any were possessed by the Admiralty, but it had never been satisfactorily ascertained how the fire originated, and all the other facts had been laid before the public.

Mr. OWEN STANLEY said, he wished to add that last year the Holyhead lifeboat went out with fifteen men on board; the boat was upset, but, all having on the life-belts supplied by the Royal Humane Society, they were picked up by a steamer with the exception of one man, and it was supposed that he had been struck by a spar.

Mr. CAVE said, that he might reply to that portion of the Question which the noble Lord had not been able to answer. Boys on board the *Worcester* were taught to swim, and since the accident occurred some time ago a rule had been made that those boys who could not swim should not be allowed to go out in sailing-boats.

EPISCOPAL RESIDENCE AT BRISTOL.

QUESTION.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government have received any communications from the City of Bristol, or whether their attention has been directed to any communications made by the City of Bristol to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners respecting the claim made for the restoration of an Episcopal Residence at Bristol; whether he is aware of the circumstances under which the union between the Sees of Bristol and Gloucester was effected, and whether he is of opinion that the sale of the residence purchased for Bishop Monk, in great part with money raised by taxation of the inhabitants of Bristol, and the application of the proceeds to the erection of the Episcopal Palace at Gloucester, without providing any substituted residence at Bristol, is in accordance with the spirit of the terms on which the union was made; and whether there will be any objection to produce any Correspondence which has taken place on the object? He would omit the clause "in great part with money raised by taxation of the inhabitants of Bristol," because the fact was that the City of Bristol was taxed to replace the Episcopal Residence in consequence of its destruction in the time of the Reform Bill riots, and its retention might lead to misapprehension.

Sir GEORGE GREY, in reply, said, he was not aware that any communication had been received from Bristol by Her Majesty's Government, and certainly his attention had not been directed to any communication made respecting the claim for the restoration of the Episcopal Residence. He was generally aware of the circumstances under which the union of the Sees was effected, but not sufficiently to express an opinion as to whether the sale of the residence purchased for Bishop Monk, and the application of the proceeds to the erection of the Episcopal Palace at Gloucester, without providing any substituted residence at Bristol, was in accordance with the spirit of the terms on which the union was made. But, on inquiry at the Ecclesiastical Commission Office, he found that there had been a Correspondence, and he believed that there would be no objection to its production.

THE THAMES EMBANKMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. CAVE said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the Metropolitan Board of Works had complied with the requisition of the Board of Trade, as suggested in the report of Messrs. Coode and Rawlinson, that they should draw larger quantities of material for the Thames Embankment from the bed of the river; and, if not, what course he proposed to take in the matter?

MR. MILNER GIBSON replied, that the Board of Trade had been in communication with the Metropolitan Board of Works on the subject, and the Board of Works passed a Resolution on Monday last, which he would read—

> "That so long as the material raised from the river opposite the embankment works continues to be, in the opinion of the engineer, suitable for the purposes of the embankment, the engineer be instructed to allow no other material to come on to the embankment works, except for the backing of the embankment wall, the cross dams, the material required for puddling, and other necessary purposes."

He had to-day received a private communication that the Metropolitan Board of Works were now acting on the spirit of that Resolution, and that the referees, to whom the question of the suitableness of the material was referred, had reported that the material dredged out of the river was, in the main, fit to be used in filling in the embankment.

SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—QUESTION.

MR. BUXTON said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he is prepared to give an answer to the application made to him by a deputation which waited upon him some time since, with regard to affording the clerks in the several Government offices the opportunity of obtaining a half-holiday on Saturday afternoons?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I think, Sir, the subject of that application is one which is very deserving of consideration. There may be some offices in which the whole of the Department could not be allowed to have a half-holiday. The Secretary to the Treasury is in communication with the officers of the different Departments in order to see how far a half-holiday on Saturday afternoons can be made consistent with the requirements of the public service. I have no doubt that a great number of the Departments can allow a half-holiday.

CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION BILL (*Lords*).

[BILL 199.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, the object of this Bill is to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed at the beginning of 1864 to consider and revise the various forms of subscription and declarations required to be taken by the clergy of the Established Church. This subject of Clerical Subscription is one that has recently occupied a good deal of public attention and occasioned much discussion. Motions have have been made in both Houses of Parliament on the matter. In the House of Lords two or three years ago a Bill was proposed, the object of which was to repeal so much of the Act of Uniformity as required a declaration to be made of unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer. In 1863 my hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone (Mr. Buxton) made a Motion of a more general character, asking the House to declare it expedient that the terms of clerical subscription should be relaxed. The Government met that Motion, not with a direct negative, but by the Previous Question, and that course, I think, was sanctioned by the general acquiescence of the House. They felt that in what was urged by my hon. Friend as to the number and complexity of the various forms of subscription required by law from the clergy, there was considerable force; they were not prepared to say that no alteration should take place; but, at the same time, they felt it would be inexpedient for the House to make any general declaration that the forms of subscription should be relaxed without being prepared with a specific proposal as to the forms of subscription that ought to be substituted. They also felt that before any specific alteration was proposed it was desirable that the whole subject should be considered and fully inquired into by a Commission appointed by the Crown. In conformity with that opinion Her Majesty was advised to issue a Royal Commission to consider and revise the various forms of subscription and declaration to be made by the clergy of the Church of England and Ireland on their appointment, admission, or induction to any benefice or office; and to report their opinion how far they might be altered consistently with due security for the declarant adherence of the clergy to the doctrines and ritual of the Church. The principle of subscription was not at all in question. It was assumed that the Church had a right to require from those who desired to enter the ranks of her clergy that they should publicly declare their general agreement with the doctrines of the Church and their readiness to conform to her ritual. The object of the Commission was to see how far those objections might be removed which were entertained to the great variety and complexity of the forms of subscription and declarations from time to time framed, and now by law required. In selecting the Members to constitute that Commission, it was the object of the Government that it should be so composed as to command the general confidence of members of the Established Church, and for that purpose they felt it desirable that it should be partly composed of clerical and partly of lay Members of the Church. They were also anxious that it should comprise Members —I will not say of different parties in the Church—but of the different phases of opinion that we know are entertained within the limits of the Church, by persons equally attached to her doctrines and formularies. And I am happy to believe that we succeeded in attaining that object. The four archbishops of the Established Church were placed on that Commission, together with several of its bishops and clergy, occupying different grades in the Church, and with them were associated twelve laymen, the Commission being presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury. To the patience, care, time, and attention bestowed on this important subject by the Commission we are indebted for the valuable report presented to Her Majesty, and by Her Majesty's commands laid some time since on the table of this House. I am happy to say that the recommendations of that report were unanimously agreed to by the Members of the Commission—in fact the only name that is, not found among the signatures to the report is that of my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford (Sir William Heathcote), and I am informed that the only reason he did not sign was because he was absent from the country, and at the time suffering from severe indisposition. We are all happy to see him

Sir George Grey

among us again, and I believe it is the intention of my hon. Friend to confirm my statement as to his entire concurrence in the report of the Commission. The Report, after setting forth the different forms of subscription and declarations now made by the clergy, and the laws under which these are required, points out some material differences existing between the subscription and declarations made by the clergy in England and those made by the clergy of the Irish branch of the Established Church. After having pointed out this, the first recommendation is that those distinctions should be removed, and that the same declarations which are required to be taken by the clergy of this country, should also be taken by the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland. Their next recommendation — the most important one, and, indeed, the main object of the Bill—is that on every occasion on which a subscription or declaration is required to be made in England or Ireland, with reference to the Articles of Religion or the Book of Common Prayer, the existing subscriptions or declarations, having reference to the doctrines and liturgy of the Church, should be discontinued; and that the following declaration should be substituted for them—

> "I, A. B., do solemnly make the following declaration. I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the Book of Common Prayer, and the ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons. I believe the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God, and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

With reference to these last words, they point to the power exercised by the Queen in Council of ordering special prayers for occasions of public thanksgiving or calamity, or such other like occasions. The other recommendations contained in the Report have reference to the oaths taken by the clergy. I need not go into them in detail, but they refer to the time at which these oaths are to be taken, and the substitution of a declaration in certain cases for these oaths. The main recommendation, substituting for the present system a general declaration of assent to the doctrines of the Church, and a willingness to conform to its ritual was not only unanimously agreed to by the Commission, but has also met with the general concurrence of other members of the Established

Church both clerical and lay, who had had the opportunity of giving consideration to the subject. The Convocations both of Canterbury and York have signified their concurrence in the most formal manner in these recommendations, and although there is no general assembly of the Church in Ireland capable of expressing its concurrence in an equally formal manner, yet the Irish branch of the Established Church was fully represented on the Commission, the two Archbishops having signed the Report in common with the other Commissioners. The Bill also comes down to us with the unanimous concurrence of the House of Lords. There is a great weight of authority, therefore, in favour of this Bill, and I believe it is calculated to confer a great and essential benefit upon the Established Church. I will just allude to the notice of Amendments given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Whiteside). In the principle of those Amendments I entirely concur, and if they are adopted they will substantially restore the Bill to the form in which it was originally proposed by the Government. They will correct what I conceive to be a mistake which has been committed by the other House in regard to the old, obsolete oath of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration required to be taken by the Act of William and Mary, instead of the consolidated oath of 21 & 22 of Victoria, which is the oath taken by the clergy of the Church in Ireland, although it is not at present exacted from the clergy of the Church in England. If that alteration should be made in the Bill, and if it should be assented to by the other House of Parliament, it will be, I think, an essential improvement. It is most satisfactory to know that this Bill has met with such universal concurrence, and I will only state my confident belief that if these recommendations are adopted, the new form of declaration will essentially secure the object which we all have in view—namely, that there should be a declared agreement on the part of those who enter the Church with the doctrines of the Church, and an avowal of their intention to conform to the liturgy and ritual of the Church. On the other hand, the adoption of these recommendations will remove objections of a serious character, founded upon the variety of subscriptions and declarations now required, and the use of terms on which very different interpretations are placed by men of great authority. These objections have had a tendency to prevent the entrance into the Church of men of the highest character and of the most undoubted attachment to the Church, and who were fitted to shed lustre upon the Establishment, and to discharge with the greatest advantage the high duties of its Ministers. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir George Grey.*)

MR. WHITESIDE: Sir, I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman as to the value and utility of this Bill. I think that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government deserve the thanks of the House for the manner in which the Commission was constituted which was empowered to inquire into this very delicate and important subject. I have also personally to thank the right hon. Gentleman for the courteous manner in which he has considered the Amendments which I have proposed, and I am entirely content with the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to deal with them. To obtain simplicity and uniformity in the Church, and at the same time to make the Bill acceptable to the class of persons to whom the right hon. Gentleman referred is a great gain to the Church. The closing words of the Commission, to which the hon. Baronet has alluded, deserve the notice of the House. They are—

> "These recommendations we now humbly offer to your Majesty. To carry them into effect some alterations must be made in the canons of the Church, and some in the statutes of the realm. We trust that our proposals will be willingly accepted both by the Church and by the State."

These are judicious suggestions, because they point to an alteration of the canons of the Church and the effect to be given to these alterations by the Legislature. How were the Articles of the Church originally prepared and confirmed? How is that matter stated in the Book of Common Prayer? It is recited that by the General Synod of the Church, acting, no doubt, with the licence of the Crown, these Articles were recommended to the Crown and adopted by the Crown, and the declaration prefixed to them in the Book of Common Prayer points to the Convocation of the Church as the proper tribunal to consider such questions, and says that whenever it is necessary to consider matters of the same nature the same high authority should be summoned again to recommend to the Crown such alterations as the wisdom of Convocation might suggest. The subsequent ratification of these Articles in the time of Elizabeth points to Convocation again as the assembly which is to express its opinion on these subjects. I have asked the right hon. Gentleman more than once during the last ten days for the document, or a copy of it, which he in official language said was in course of preparation. It is what is called a licence to be granted to the Convocation of Canterbury or York, or either of them. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman's labours are so weighty that he has been unable to prepare that difficult and elaborate paper. The more I press the right hon. Gentleman for the paper the more reluctant he appears to be to present it, but now that Parliament is about to be dissolved, I suppose it will be laid on the table of the House. I have a serious question to ask the right hon. Gentleman with reference to this point. I do not complain of the heads of the Church in England being consulted. It was the duty of the Government to consult them. I do not complain of the Convocation of the Church being called upon to give its assent to what is originated, particularly when the Crown can suggest the subject to be discussed, and afterwards affirm it by its license. Nothing can be more temperate or more respectful than to give that power to the Church. But I do not comprehend the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman in issuing a paper which would call upon Convocation to give a political "Amen" to an Act of Parliament that had been already passed. In relation, therefore, to the question as touching the Irish branch of the Church, I beg to refer to a protest which has been laid upon the table of the other House of Parliament, and of which I have procured a copy. Now, let me say, first, that I support the Bill cordially, and I think the Amendments which I propose to introduce will make it an excellent measure. But I am speaking now of the manner in which the Convocation of England are asked to give their opinion, and of the abrupt and somewhat contumelious style in which the right hon. Baronet has snuffed out the Convocation of Ireland. The protest drawn up by certain eminent members of the Irish episcopal body was in these terms—

"*Dissentient:—*

"1. Because that, while agreeing that it is expedient to simplify and assimilate the Laws of Clerical Subscription in all the Provinces of the United Church of England and Ireland, and while acquiescing in the general Reasonableness of the Recommendations made in the Report of the Royal Commissioners upon which this Bill is founded, we deem it inconsistent with the ancient Customs of this Church and Realm that in a Spiritual Matter so nearly affecting the whole Body of the Clergy, Canons enacted with the Assent of the Crown, by the Bishops and Clergy synodically assembled, should be altered or annulled without a Royal Licence previously given to them to re-consider and alter those Canons.

"2. Because the Course taken in the bringing in and passing this Bill, which alters, without the Concurrence of all the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England and Ireland synodically assembled, Canons of the Church respecting Clerical Subscription as a Condition of Admission into Holy Orders, is regarded by us as not only without adequate Precedent, but without sufficient Ground of general Expediency.

"3. Because we think that the passing of this Bill, *with* the Concurrence of the English, but *without* the Concurrence of the Irish Bishops and Clergy synodically convened, may appear prejudicial to their undoubted Right to a full Participation in the Common Privileges of the Spirituality of the United Church, a Right declared by the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland to be an essential and fundamental Part of the Union of those Kingdoms."

I submit that it would be a very difficult thing, even for a Gentleman so well informed as the right hon. Baronet, to answer satisfactorily the reasons contained in that Protest. I beg now to draw attention to a petition which I have had the honour to present from the University of Dublin, and which bears the seal of the University. It states a legal difficulty upon which I should like to have the opinion of the Attorney General. What is the meaning and what can be the effect of this licence to be granted to the Convocation of Canterbury or York, or both, to deal with an Act of Parliament after the Act of Parliament has passed? It is only giving them license to say "Amen" to the Act of Parliament, and that is a thing the advantage of which I cannot comprehend. To give the Convocation of the English branch of the Church by licence a right to consider the subject matter of a canon was becoming; but the granting of such a licence as this is not very respectful to Convocation, and has no sense of significance in regard to the canons of the Church. The petition of the provost, fellows, and scholars of the University of Dublin states—

> "That the Clerical Subscription Bill now before Parliament affects the interests of the Irish branch of the Church in the same degree as it affects the interests of the English branch, and the same reasons which have rendered it desirable to give permission to the provinces of Canterbury and York to express their opinion as to any alteration of their canons and obligations apply with equal force to the Irish provinces of the United Church.
>
> "That your petitioners do not wish to oppose the progress of the aforesaid Bill, but they pray that your honourable House would be pleased to devise in your wisdom such measures as will hereafter give to the Irish clergy a power of expressing their opinion, in conjunction with the English clergy, on matters affecting the common interest of the United Church, and especially that you will preserve in its integrity the union of the Churches of England and Ireland."

I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman his authority for stating that there is nobody known to the law in Ireland which could express its opinion on the question. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman of a matter which occurred in the time of the Bishop of Llandaff, just prior to the union, when the necessity of introducing certain securities for the Church of Ireland was being discussed. In the memoirs of the Bishop of Llandaff there appears a correspondence between him and the Archbishop of Canterbury as to whether it would be wise or politic to introduce into the Act of Union a clause or two clauses pointing out the manner in which, after the passing of the measure, Convocation should be assembled. Convocation in Ireland had met from time to time, and Wentworth Lord Strafford drew the Article which identified the doctrine and discipline of the two Churches of England and Ireland. The Convocation of Ireland lay dormant for a time, as the Convocation of England had done for eighty years, but that was no proof of its non-existence. The Act of 1793 (33 *Geo*. III., c. 29), an Act to prevent the meeting of unlawful assemblies, says—

> "Save and except the knights, citizens, and burgesses elected to serve in the Parliament thereof, and save and except the Houses of Convocation duly summoned by the King's writ."

Now, what occurred prior to the Union on the subject? It seems that a communication had been addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, and he, being puzzled, consulted the Bishop of Llandaff, who thought himself an ill-used Prelate because he was not made an archbishop. He seemed to have been rather liberal in his views. The Bishop of Llandaff says—

> "The Archbishop of Canterbury had asked my opinion relative to the Church of Ireland, and I sent to him the following letter, dated 5th March, 1860:—'My Lord Archbishop—I think the Act of Parliament proposed by the Archbishop of Cashel and Dr. Duignan to be wholly unnecessary, but I approve of the addition to the 5th Article suggested by the Lord Lieutenant (an addition relative to the mode in which Convocation was to be summoned). I approve, however, of this addition merely as it may tend to conciliate those who seem to entertain apprehensions for the security of the Irish Church, and not as thinking it in any degree requisite for that end, which is in no degree endangered by the union. A united Convocation will sufficiently unite both the Churches of England and Ireland at present and as to all future changes, if it should be ever thought expedient to make any; and, as to identification, the Churches are at present identified, not only in the leading principles of Protestantism and Episcopacy, but in doctrine, discipline, and worship. Above all things, I wish the Church of England to forbear affecting a superiority over that of Ireland, by attempting to obtain an appellate jurisdiction to the see of Canterbury."

Now, that is a recommendation which I hope the English branch of the United Church of England and Ireland will take to heart. We in Ireland cannot submit to be snuffed out so unceremoniously as the right hon. Baronet proposes to snuff us out. I beg now to call attention to some correspondence of the late Primate of Ireland, in order to correct an observation made in another place by Earl Granville, who stated that the late Primate of Ireland was unfavourable to Convocation. In a certain sense Earl Granville was right, in another sense he was wrong. The late Primate was opposed to a provincial Convocation; for he was always of opinion that the only Convocation which would be of any worth would be the Convocation pointed out by the Treaty of Union, intended by Mr. Pitt, and following as the necessary consequence from the Great Compact itself. But to pass to another matter. Has the right hon. Gentleman been well advised by his lawyers when he said that the Queen could order prayers without the consent of the Church? Did I understand him to say that? I believe that it is a very doubtful matter, though I have no doubt at all that no one would be more likely to make such an order in a pious spirit, or to direct what is right. But would it be binding on each branch of the Church? Who first devised the forms of prayer? The Church is not a Parliamentary engine, to be used or laid aside by the Minister of the day. In due submission to the Crown, as the supreme Governor of the Realm, it has rights of its own, and I do not think the House will be disposed to deprive it of that ancient authority. There is another question I should like to put to the right hon. Gentleman. In the case of a general canon—I am not speaking of a provincial regulation—can that general canon, establishing a general principle, and sanctioned in a general synod of the Church, be got rid of by the decision of one province of York or Canterbury? A very serious question arises when you wish to make improvements and reforms—and I admit that reforms may properly be made—namely, what is the authority by which they can be carried out? I admit that the laity are not bound by canons which may bind the clergy; but *quoad* the Church the canons are binding, and can the province of York or Canterbury pass a canon binding on the whole Church? Clearly not I think. Take the canon relating to sponsors, which orders that parents ought not to be sponsors for their own children, which is a general canon of the whole Church—does the right hon. Gentleman say that the sanction of a general synod would not be necessary to change the 29th canon? Could it be got rid of by an Order in Council, or by a decision of one branch, either of York or Canterbury? It is right to consider proposals of reform and improvement, and I admit that the canons require reform and improvement; but what is the lawful authority by which these improvements can be effected? When it was proposed to alter the 29th canon, relating to sponsors, the Primate and Bishops of Ireland addressed a memorial to Her Majesty, in which they said that—

> "The Convocation of the province of Canterbury having applied for and obtained your Majesty's licence for the purpose, has repealed the 29th canon, and in place thereof enacted a new canon, which now awaits your Majesty's sanction."

And that "the convocation of York has likewise asked for and received a licence for the same purpose." They added that they understood that steps were taken by the province of Canterbury to frame new forms of prayer for thanksgiving after harvest, and for other occasions, and to regulate discipline; and they added—

> "A new rule of sponsorship, new forms of prayer, and a new law of discipline, if introduced in the province of Canterbury alone, or in the provinces of Canterbury and York, to the exclusion of the Irish provinces, would disturb the uniformity of the Church and violate the spirit of the Act of Union. In such grave matters we conceive that the whole united Church is concerned and that, in such matters, the advice, not of one or two provincial synods only should be taken, but of a general synod of the United Church of England and Ireland."

This was in July, 1861, and the usual formal acknowledgment of its receipt was forwarded, but it appeared then to have been forgotten by the right hon. Gentleman. The fact was, the right hon. Gentleman could not answer it, and the alteration of the 29th canon was not proceeded with, which shows that the memorial was founded in reason. In February, 1862, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the name of the Convocation of his province, acting towards the Irish Church with that kindness and consideration and brotherly feeling which from such men might be expected, wrote to the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, communicating what had been done to obtain the authorization of a special form of thanksgiving for harvest, and to—

> "Request their Graces to take such steps as to them may seem expedient to obtain the advice and concurrence of their branch of the United Church;"

forgetful that there was no mode of obtaining that concurrence. In June, 1862, the right hon. Baronet gave an answer to the Primate as follows:—

> "As your Grace has expressed a desire to know Her Majesty's decision, Her Majesty's Government have not felt it to be their duty to advise Her Majesty to convene a general synod of the United Church of England and Ireland. They believe that no such synod ever was convened, and they are not aware that, if convened, it would have any legal power."

I should like to ask the Attorney General whether, if there were such a synod, he holds that it would have no legal power? What power has the Convocation now assembled? If it be assembled by an act of courtesy, why not ask the other branches of the same Church also to assemble? If it be unlawful, why allow it to assemble at all? I should like also to ask the Attorney General what rights he considers the Irish Church has under the Act of Union? At that important epoch the Irish House of Commons passed a Resolution—

> "That the Churches of England and Ireland shall be united into one Church, and the archbishops, priests, &c., of the Churches of England and Ireland shall from time to time be summoned to and entitled to sit in convocation of the United Church in the same manner as now established in the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the said United Church shall be preserved as now by law established for the Church of England."

That was the proposal of Lord Cornwallis, and the Government referred to by the Bishop of Llandaff and the Archbishop of Canterbury, as I have before mentioned. That was amended in the House of Lords, leaving it that—

> "When his Majesty shall summon a Convocation of the Irish clergy they shall be summoned to sit in such Convocation of the United Church."

That article was laid on the table of the English House of Commons by Mr. Pitt on the 21st of April; but when the Bill was in Committee Mr. Pitt said—

> "It was judged better to omit the insertion of any provisional article respecting the Convocation until the union actually took place, more particularly as his Majesty, as the head of both Churches, had the power to call such a Convocation when he pleased."

And the clause proposed was struck out on that ground with the consent of the Irish Parliament; but the union of the two Churches was an essential part of the Act of Union. As a question of law, then, I ask again, is it possible for any other Convocation now to sit for the purpose of altering a general canon of the United Church save and except a Convocation in which the whole of that Church is represented? Three learned persons in this country were asked for their opinion on this question. The opinion was to the effect that if a Bill were to be introduced to alter a canon, the approval of the prelates and clergy of the United Church should be procured. If Convocation be required for the purpose of altering or amending the law of the Church, the policy and the legality are equally clear of allowing the Church authorities in Ireland an opportunity of joining in that Convocation. Those authorities give a hearty assent to the wise and tolerant measure now recommended to the House. I would suggest to the Lord Chancellor to consider what Convocation could be assembled to pass a canon binding on the whole Church except the Convocation referred to in the Act of Union as originally drawn. For my part, I am always surprised to hear Gentleman say that they have a prejudice against Convocation, and I do not think that to be a very tolerant feeling. Every branch of the Christian Church is allowed to assemble to make regulations for the management of its own body, and I do not believe that, if the United Church of England and Ireland, which has a great history, a magnificent literature, and functions which she has discharged faithfully and well, were allowed in like manner to assemble, the heads of the Church would run counter to the sense of the nation or to the spirit of the Parliament.

MR. BUXTON said, he certainly would not venture to touch on the question as to the claims of the Convocation of the United Church to be heard on this matter, and he would not have risen at all to address the House were it not that he had regretted to observe that the importance of the changes with regard to the tests imposed on the clergy that had been proposed by the Commission which sat last year, and which were embodied in the Bill before them, had been depreciated in some quarters, as if, after all, those tests would remain about as stringent as they had been before. Now, he admitted that the change did not go so far in the way of relaxation as he could himself have wished; but, at the same time, he thought that it was one of great importance, and he also thought that the precedent now established was in itself of great value. It was a remarkable fact that a Commission, including eight archbishops and bishops, and several other dignitaries of the Church, should have unanimously agreed to sweep away the whole of the existing declarations required from the clergy, and to substitute a perfectly new form; and that this reform should also have been acquiesced in by Convocation; and he confidently maintained that the change thus unanimously agreed to was radical in its kind, though it might be too moderate in degree. The distinction between the proposed test and those now existing was this, that whereas at present those who took orders or promotion in the Church were obliged to declare that they accepted all and everything contained either in the Prayer Book or the Thirty-nine Articles, in future they would only affirm their acceptance of the doctrine of the Church contained in those books as a whole, without pledging themselves to a belief in every assertion and every dogma that the Church in those books might have laid down. Having been himself a Member of the Commission which proposed this change, he was in a position to affirm that it was the express intention of the Commission to relax the extravagant stringency of the existing tests; in other words, to make it possible for men to minister at the altars of the Church, although they might dissent from some part of her teaching, provided, however, they accepted it as a whole. To that last condition they had undoubtedly felt bound to submit; in fact, it was plain that if such declarations were to be preserved at all, it was essential that those who took them should be called upon to declare virtually that they were *bonâ fide* members of the Church whose ministers they desired to be. So far they must all be agreed. They might differ on the question whether such tests should be applied at all; but if they were to be maintained it was manifest that their tenour must be of that kind. But what the Commission had aimed at was, on the one hand, to preserve such a general concurrence, but, on the other, to afford the clergy scope for some independence of thought within those wide bounds; and they certainly conceived that that end had in a considerable degree been attained in the proposal to which they had agreed. Look at the difference between these tests and the old ones. In the latter the intending clergyman declared that "willingly and *ex animo*" he gave his unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, and also that he accepted "each and every" of the Thirty-nine Articles of religion. In these words, the stringency of which had been sedulously wrought up to the highest possible point, and in a variety of other phrases astonishingly numerous and complicated, the clergyman was so bound down, that if it had been possible for restrictions of that kind to produce their intended effect, there would have been a total extinction of anything like independence of thought within the borders of the Established Church. Now, it was of the greatest importance to observe that all those phrases which indicated that the subscriber declared his acceptance of every dogma of the Church had been swept away; and this had been done expressly and of forethought. As regarded the Thirty-nine Articles, the Commission had agreed to sweep away the words, "each and every of them;" implying, therefore, that the subscriber was only to take them as a whole, even though he might disagree with them here and there. The omission was of great importance. It was expressly intended, in order that the subscriber might feel that, provided he accepted the Articles as a whole, he was not to be excluded from the ministry because he might differ from certain portions of them. As regarded the Prayer Book the change was even still more marked; for, instead of declaring his assent and consent to all and everything it contained, he only declared his assent to the Book of Prayer—that is to say, to the book as a whole; and his belief that the doctrine of the Church therein set forth was agreeable to the word of God. Observe, that he would not declare that the doctrines in the plural number, or that each and all of the doctrines were agreeable to the word of God, but only the doctrine of the Church in the singular number. It was expressly and unanimously agreed by the Commission that the word doctrine should be used in the singular number in order that it might be understood that it was the general teaching and not every part and parcel of that teaching to which assent was given. Having been in communication with the leaders of the party in the Church who were most anxious to relax the stringency of the tests imposed on the clergy, he was able to say that they regarded the proposed change as one of considerable value. And although it did not go as far as he himself and others could have wished, still its tendency went to this, that the subscriber would no longer bind himself to every particular doctrine, to every jot and tittle of the dogmatic teaching of the Church, but only to a general acceptance of that teaching. As far as this Bill tended to that result its value must be great. The time had arrived when it had become essential to allow great scope for independent thought to those who were to minister at the altars of the Church. No thoughtful man who watched the history of his own time could have failed to observe the mighty revolution that had been silently going forward in the national mind, and with accelerated rapidity during the last few years, in the growing resistance in men's minds to dogmatic religious teaching. Whether they regarded that movement with regret or with hope and satisfaction the fact could not be denied. Men of education and intelligence were more and more refusing to submit their minds to traditional teaching merely. They had grown more resolute in character and were more and more applying their own reason with force and boldness to the doctrines presented to them by their Church. This movement was doubtless looked upon by many with extravagant alarm. For his part he could not but believe that the faith of the people would become only the more high and noble under the invigorating influence of courageous thought. But whether that were so or not, it was in vain to blind themselves to these facts; and those who wished to see the Church hold her own in this land and spreading further and deeper her holy and benign influence must rejoice if she were willing in any degree to adapt herself to the necessities of the time, and to the progress of human thought, instead of engaging in a short-sighted and futile resistance to the advancing tide. If, while the intelligent and energetic youth of the country was determined to use its reason freely, and to repudiate any attempt to enforce intellectual subjection, the Church should still persist in demanding from her ministers an absolute and uncompromising submission of mind to all and every portion of her dogmatic teaching, the inevitable result must be to sever the Church from the intellectual energy of the time, to hand over to feeble and narrow minds the high function of instructing the people in religious truth, and thus to weaken her power and degrade her character. It was in that sense and with that view that, two years ago, he had called the attention of that House to this subject for the first time; and he was persuaded that this measure would not only relieve many tender consciences from a cruel burden, but would tend to maintain the connection between the Established Church and the stirring intellect of the age.

Mr. BRISCOE said, this was a subject of a grave and important nature, and it might have been supposed that the House would have been attended by a much larger number of Members. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Maidstone (Mr. Buxton) regretted that the alterations made by the Bill had not been carried to a greater extent. Now he (Mr. Briscoe), had paid some attention to the subject, and he was not surprised to find that the Archdeacon of Middlesex considered that this was one of the most important measures affecting the Church since the time of Henry VIII. When it was said that it had been unanimously approved by Convocation, it seemed to be forgotten that the Bishop of Lincoln had expressed his extreme regret at seeing the words "I do willingly and *ex animo*" altered into the feeble phrase "I do solemnly make the following declaration." The Bishop of Peterborough entirely agreed with the Bishop of Lincoln that it would be unwise to omit from the declaration the words "willingly and *ex animo*," which afforded a security for the Church. The hon. Member for Maidstone said that the measure would relieve tender consciences; but did it, he asked, alter a single word in any of the services of the Church or in any of the Thirty-nine Articles? Were the clergy not still to be solemnly required to use those services and teach those Articles? How could it be said that they were to consent to the whole of the Prayer Book, but not to every part? The whole was made up of the different parts, and he was at a loss to understand how a man of candour could say that his conscience was relieved by that measure. As to the words "assent and consent," though some had contended that they were synonymous, he found from *Webster's Dictionary* that "assent" was only an agreement of the understanding to an abstract proposition, but that "consent" was an act of the will. For instance, "assent" was given by Her Majesty to all Acts of Partiament; but Her Majesty did not thereby consent to all that those Acts contained. She assented to do that without which all Acts of Parliament would be null and void. He thought it was evident that some difference of opinion did prevail among the members of the Royal Commission, and it had no doubt led to a compromise. He was aware that there were clergymen in the Church who entertained sincere objections to certain of its services, such as that—of the burial service—the visitation of the sick—the baptismal service, &c., and he would say let their consciences be relieved; but let it be done by a revision of the parts of the service to which they objected. The clergy would still be required to use these services, and he could not see how their consciences would be relieved by an alteration in the mode of taking the oath. Then he would ask whether the 20,000 clergymen were to make this new declaration, or was it to apply only to those who should be ordained after the passing of this Bill. He wished to know whether under this Bill existing clergymen were to be allowed to take the new form of subscription, in order that their conciences might be relieved, or whether its provisions would be applied only to a new class of clergymen. Were they to have two classes of clergymen, one of which would not be relieved from the conscientious scruples they entertained, while the other would be allowed to put what interpretation they chose on the Articles to which they objected? Grave as he thought the measure, he should not have ventured, as the hon. Member for

Maidstone had done, to call it a "radical change." He supposed that a difference of opinion had existed in the Commission, and that a compromise had been come to. But he had felt bound to make these few remarks on the second reading of so important a Bill, and he must say, in conclusion, that he would be glad if some means could be found for restoring to the declaration the words "willingly and *ex animo.*"

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he regarded the measure as an advance, although a small one, in the right direction, and as such it should have his most cordial assent. He wished to say a few words upon what had fallen from the right hon. Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Whiteside) in reference to the Irish Convocation. It certainly appeared to him that if it was necessary in any way to obtain the assent or concurrence of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church in England, the like course should also have been taken in regard to the Irish Church. As long as that strange anomaly, the Irish Established Church, existed, the same course ought to be pursued in respect to it in such matters as was pursued in respect to the English Church, and therefore he quite agreed in what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman on that point. But he would ask the Attorney General for what purpose the assent of Convocation was required? The 9th Section of this Bill expressly enacted that no subscriptions or declarations other than those required by the Bill should be taken by any of the clergy after the passing of that Act. It appeared to him, therefore, that it was idle to ask Convocation to make a new canon on that subject, because if the canon passed by them differed from the Act it would be void—if only in the words of the Act it would be superfluous and unnecessary. The Convocation had appeared to feel the helplessness of their position, and instead of waiting for the Royal licence to make a new canon, had taken the discussion on the new subscription on application for a licence. He wished, therefore, to know whether the custom which had grown up in Convocation of discussing these matters without waiting for the Royal licence was a constitutional one. The usual course had been since the Act of Submission, commonly called the "Muzzling Act," to wait till the licence was given them before discussing any important matter connected with the Church. Perhaps he might be allowed to quote on this point a few sentences from one of the greatest authorities on this subject—he meant Lathbury—who said—

> "From the preceding narrative it will be seen that the Convocation is assembled by the Royal writ, but that they are not properly an ecclesiastical synod until the licence for business is granted. It is merely the licence for business that is now wanting to permit the Convocation to transact any matters which the Crown might recommend or the circumstances of the Church require."

Again—

> "The Convocation has not acted as a provincial synod for many years, because the Royal licence has not been granted. As soon as the licence is issued a power is given to the Convocation which it did not previously possess, though assembled by Royal writ. It is then a provincial synod, and competent to transact ecclesiastical affairs.
>
> "They are a Convocation by his writ of summons; but a council, properly speaking, they are not, nor can they legally act as such till they have obtained the King's licence so to do."

He might add to this the authority of Lord Macaulay—an authority on constitutional questions of this kind of very great eminence. Lord Macaulay said—

> "The Convocation has, happily for our country, been so long utterly insignificant that till a recent period none but curious students cared to inquire how it was constituted. The law, as it had been interpreted during a long course of years, prohibited the Convocation from even deliberating on any ecclesiastical ordinance without a previous warrant from the Crown."

The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Whiteside) asked what objection that side of the House had to the meeting of Convocation. Now, for his own part, he certainly had no objection to any meeting of the clergy to discuss subjects, whether at Willis's Rooms, at Oxford, or in any other place. What he objected to was their meeting to discuss in Convocation under colour of legal authority, when they had none whatever. He objected to their claims to be considered as a necessary part of the Constitution, to the extent of their consent being necessary to the legislation of Parliament. For a great many years Convocation had been entirely silent. They had heard nothing of it, and he believed nothing had been done by the Ministers of the Crown to recall it into existence. It had been called into existence by a curious process of spontaneous regeneration. He believed he was right in stating that there had been no authority given by the Crown for Convocation to meet and discuss any such matter, and it was therefore important the House should know why Government had submitted the new subscription for the assent of Convocation. The right hon. Gentleman had asked what objection they had to Convocation, and he could not do better than answer him from the words of the late Archbishop of Canterbury. In a debate on the revival of Convocation in the House of Lords in 1852 he said—

> "Between independent bodies of religionists and the Church of England no parallel can be established. They are not involved in the Constitution of the country. They may meet and deliberate and resolve without constituting that anomaly in Government an *imperium in imperio*. The debates which will be constantly occurring will rather tend to foment than to allay dissensions, to multiply rather than to prevent divisions."

On the same occasion the late Archbishop of Dublin said—

> "He had never advocated the restoration of the Convocation as the governing body of the Church, because, besides other objections, he was of opinion that the government of the Church by the clergy could not, and should not, be tolerated in these days. The revival of Convocation, as it at present existed, or, indeed, any attempt to govern the Church by means of the clergy exclusively, he should think highly inexpedient and not a little unjust."

What he objected to, as lying at the foundation of all these questions, was the notion that the Church of England consisted of the clergy only. The Church of England consisted mainly of the laity, and the clergy were only a portion of it [Mr. WHITESIDE: And the Prelates.] Well, the Prelates were also a portion of it; but the new doctrine put forward in Convocation was that the clergy only were, in fact, the Church of England. That doctrine had constantly been put forward in the debates which had recently taken place in Convocation on this subject. Considerable gratification had been expressed that the Government was ready to submit the matter to them. They did not, however, hear much of the Bill itself; there was little discussion on it; but there was a strong expression of gratification that they were permitted to meet for the purpose of discussing it. He must be allowed to quote a few words from the speeches of two of the most eminent members of Convocation—Archdeacon Denison and Canon Wordsworth. Archdeacon Denison said—

> "Convocation is the Church of England by representation, and that Church is the primary institution of this country, around which all the others revolve and revert to for precedents of authority. I congratulate Convocation upon the fact that our rulers have awakened out of that darkness which surrounded them with respect to its functions and position."

Canon Wordsworth said—

> "We can only consider it as an acknowledgment from the highest personages in the land that the Convocation is a co-ordinate member and integral part of the English Constitution."

For his part he rather agreed with the opinion of that very high authority, Mr. Fox, who, in the debate on the eligibility of Horne Tooke, said—

> "He had trusted that this phantom of the Convocation had disappeared for ever, for he had long conceived all its powers to have expired. He could not refrain from quoting two lines of an English poet, where he introduced common sense as a queen governing the world by her sway:—
>
> "'Fair Common sense, while thou dost reign on earth,
> "'The Convocation will not meet again.'
>
> He could not suffer himself for a moment to believe that the national character was so degraded as ever to submit to the revival of Convocation in our land."

Before sitting down he could not help observing that it was unfortunate that the Report of the Royal Commission on which this Bill was founded did not give the discussion which must have preceded their Report. It would have been interesting to know by what process unanimity had been arrived at among so many of the clergy and others differing so widely on the important subjects discussed. It was unfortunate that they had not, in the Report on which the Bill was founded, some of the reasons in support of it. He made these observations because he knew that in some quarters considerable alarm was felt lest the new subscription should alter the legal status of the clergy, and that by a side-wind the Bill might be used to set aside some recent decisions of the Privy Council. He did not himself believe that it would have that effect, but he regretted that the Report had not been more full, as it would have dissipated these alarms.

MR. HADFIELD said, he was much interested in the discussion, as he considered the Bill to be a most extraordinary chapter in the history of England. Two centuries ago an Act was passed—the Uniformity Act—to make people pray and preach exactly alike, when a large number of the clergy seceded and were persecuted for so doing. The preamble of this Bill declared that the subscriptions, declarations, and oaths, required to be taken by the clergy were, by the enlightened opinion of the country, deemed to be improper. Now, what would have been the result if that had been declared 200 years ago? How many Dissenters from the Church would there then have been? According to the census of 1851 the attendance at worship by Dissenters exceeded that of the members of the Church by 300,000 persons. He denied that they had shrunk from inquiry into that point in 1861. His hon. Friend (Mr. Baines) moved for the same test as in 1851, and it was refused by the House, or a larger majority of attendances might have been shown. As to Convocation, it was a great misfortune it was revived some years ago? He might ask what was Convocation? Was it for the province of Canterbury, or for York, or for Ireland, or for all three? That Convocation was an insult to the community of this country. The settlement of Church affairs existed, not in the Convocation of Canterbury, York, or Ireland, but in that House. Therefore it was that he insisted upon putting an end to that irresponsible body. If this Bill was intended to relieve tender consciences why did they not apply the axe to the root of the tree? Why did they not amend their Burial Service and their Form of Visitation of the Sick? The fact was, that they dared not undertake that work of revision. Why did they not proceed to alter the Church Catechism—a Catechism which the majority of the members of the Church of England itself did not embrace, and which parents shrank from having their children brought into contact with? It was undoubtedly true that the doctrinal articles of the Church of England were more consistently held by the great majority of the Nonconformists than by the Members of the Church itself. The members of the Church differed more from each other than the bulk of Nonconformists did from them. It was a satisfaction to him that the voluntary system had caused a revival of spiritual life within the Church of England itself. It was not disadvantageous to the country to have different denominations, and he believed that the Church had within it the power of a spiritual life which would be a blessing to the world if duly reformed and dissociated from the State. The Nonconformists rejoiced in that fact; and what they opposed was those things which had a tendency to destroy that power and its usefulness. He would not offer opposition to the Bill. If it afforded relief to the tender consciences of any part of the clergy, let them by all means have it. He regretted that in the Church of England there was among some of the clergy a tendency to forms and ceremonies which might be honestly and consistently adopted by Roman Catholics, but which could not be honestly and consistently entertained by those who received Protestant pay from a Protestant Church.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, as several questions have been addressed to me in the course of this discussion, it would have been my duty to have taken part in this debate, if there had been no other reason to induce my rising. Before, however, answering those questions I will venture to make a few observations upon the general object and effect of this Bill, and, in doing so, I may express my belief that it would be very easy either to overstate or to understate its value and effect. If any man thinks it would be a good thing to emancipate the clergy of the Church of England from the obligations which they are under, to adhere and conform loyally to the principles and the doctrines of the Church of which they are members, he certainly could not regard this Bill as in any way applying the axe to the root of the tree. Nor does it in any way alter the substance of the doctrine, discipline, or formularies of the Church. Still less does it aim at affording any encouragement to clergymen to belong to the Church, to take part in its ministry, and to share in its emoluments, without at the same time being loyal and conscientious members of that Church — an encouragement which, if offered, I could not but regard as immoral and demoralizing. What was said by my hon. Friend (Mr. Buxton) has been misunderstood. What my hon. Friend meant was, that the end the Bill was intended to accomplish was to relieve scrupulous consciences from a restraint which seemed to them to be imposed upon the exercise of that reasonable degree of liberty which was consistent with loyal adherence to the Church, and which there was reason to believe all wise legislators for the Church, whether spiritual or temporal, had intended to permit. I cannot but think that, in this respect, the relief which this measure is calculated to afford by the change in the declarations is likely to be attended with salutary effects. In truth, we are reminded on this occasion of an argument employed in the discussion of the Roman Catholic Oaths Bill—an argument which, I believe, had a good deal of weight with some hon. Members. In that discussion it was not merely urged that the oath—the abolition of which was proposed—would be objectionable in principle if it received this or that interpretation, but the chief objection made against it was that no one knew what the real interpretation was. If I were one of the clergy I should myself be disposed to place upon it the construction suggested by the context of the Act of Uniformity, and to hold that it merely meant that the subscribers unreservedly consented to the use of the whole and every part of the forms in question ; but I cannot deny that there is a tendency in its terms to catch at tender and scrupulous consciences, and to exact, or seem to exact, a more complete concurrence of opinion and judgment, as well as practice, than could be reasonably expected of any man with respect to formularies so extensive — a concurrence which, moreover, is not necessary for the purpose of an honest and practical submission and obedience. No doubt many minds have been troubled by it, because they thought that it meant, "This is exactly the service which I like best ; there is nothing in it that I dislike or would desire to see changed." I do not believe that that was the meaning of the declaration; but if any such scrupulous consciences can be relieved by this measure which has met with such unanimous concurrence, I shall greatly rejoice that such a conclusion has been arrived at. Besides, if there were nothing else in the Bill, the mere simplification which it will introduce into the declaration, by getting rid of the unnecessary variety of subscriptions which now prevail, will be a good thing ; and I do not think that it will prove what an hon. Member seemed to think it might—a sort of banner of revolution to the Church. The substituted form of the declaration affords, I think, sufficient safeguard to the Church, and is not in any way inconsistent with the firmest adherence to the principle of holding its ministers bound to render strict obedience to its doctrines and discipline. If the alteration, while doing this, is calculated at the same time to relieve the difficulties which affect the consciences of some clergymen, the result is one with which we have every reason to feel satisfied; and this I believe, is the view in which the Church generally will regard the measure. I will now leave the general subject of the Bill, and come to those questions which have been put to me by some hon. Members. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Whiteside) made a speech in which I understood him not so much to object to the Government consenting to the request of the English Convocation that they may be permitted to take their part in this alteration with a view to the consistency of their own canons, but to urge upon the Government, in case that request were granted, that it would be inconsistent and wrong not to do the same thing with regard to the Irish Convocation. It would, perhaps, seem to be a somewhat technical answer to say that, in the case of the Irish Church, there is no existing Convocation or synod by whom a similar application could have been made. If there were reason to suppose that the general sense of the Irish Church might refuse to accept the proposal contained in this Bill as a desirable and salutary change, then there would be more force in the objection that they should be consulted. There is, however, this substantial difficulty in the way, that you have at this moment no Irish Convocation or synod in existence. In order to consult it you would in short have to create a Convocation in Ireland. It is not said that, for the purpose of legislation, it is necessary to ask the advice of Convocation ; for everybody admits that if this Act of Parliament passes it must be obeyed. Neither is there any doubt as to whether the Irish Church regards the proposed change as desirable and salutary. The only question, therefore, is, whether the Crown should, in fact, create an Irish Convocation in order that it might show it the courtesy of asking its opinion. In England such is not the case. In this country, even when Convocation had nothing to do but to address the Crown, it was regularly elected and always met. That being so, and the Convocation, now sitting, having signified their desire to co-operate as far as lay in their power in the change recommended by the Royal Commissioners by adapting certain of their canons to that change, there is, I consider, good reason why the Government should accede to their application. But surely this cannot be an equally good reason for calling into existence and electing solely for this purpose an Irish Convocation which has never been in the habit of meeting under similar circumstances. No disrespect, I may add, to the Irish Church was ever intended by the Government. The simple truth is that a practical difficulty was involved in the matter, arising out of the non-existence of such an organized body as Convocation in that country, actually holding session and ready to discuss the subject. The Government did not think it indispensable that this form should be gone through, and not deeming it to be indispensably necessary they did not look upon it as expedient. With respect to the English Convocation, I cannot help thinking that the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) has shown in the observations which he made this evening less liberality than belongs to his character and the general tenour of his speeches; nor does he appear to me to be very well read in the history of our laws upon this subject. What was it that the English Convocation wanted to do? It might really be a matter of secondary importance, but from their point of view no alteration of ecclesiastical discipline can be considered as unimportant. There were several of their canons dealing with this particular question, embodying on the face of one of them the form of declaration you propose to alter, and then referring to that in others, so that if an Act of Parliament were passed, prohibiting the use of that form of declaration, there would be certain canons, not inoperative, which would be on the face of them in verbal conflict, and, to some extent, substantially in conflict with the law of the land. They ask, therefore, for permission to adapt all these canons to the changes which there is reason to believe Parliament is likely to sanction. And is it not, I would appeal to the House, better, in dealing with Convocation, or with any other body possessing authority in the Established Church, to have their cordial co-operation and goodwill in accepting and carrying out any changes which you may introduce, than to show disrespect for them by declining their assistance, not when seeking to do anything contrary to the inclination of Parliament or anything illiberal or against the spirit of the times, but when concurring with Parliament in a measure which points in a liberal direction, and which their concurrence will cause to work more harmoniously and more for the good of the Church than if it seemed to be forced on them by pressure from without? It would, in my opinion, be a deliberate affront and outrage to the Church, if, when so reasonable a request as this was made for a purpose so liberal and so laudable, you, for the mere purpose of giving them a slap in the face, told them you would not allow that which they asked. This leads me to some more general remarks on what fell from the hon. Member for Reading on the subject of Convocation. I do not think that on that subject he has read history aright. He doubts the authority of Convocation to enter into the consideration of a question of this kind, even for the purpose of applying for a licence to the Crown; but he seems to forget that Convocation, whether regarded as an unimportant or an important and respectable body, is as much a part of the institutions of this country as Parliament itself. It forms, and has formed from very ancient times, the particular mode by which the clergy of the Church of England have met together as a representative body, acting under the control of the State and subject to the authority of the Crown, to do that which, according to the law of the Church and State, they were entitled to do. Convocation is summoned by the Queen's writ as often as Parliament is called together and meets to deliberate on important matters. It is in the power of the Crown to put a stop to its deliberations by simply proroguing it. It is well known that, from the time of Bishop Hoadley to within a recent period, it was the regular practice to stop their deliberations by prorogation, though of late years it has not been thought expedient to exercise the undoubted power of the Crown in that respect. The hon. Member for Reading went on to speak of the Act of Henry VIII. as the "Muzzling Act," and seemed to think it would be advisable still to apply the gagging principle to the clergy. Now, a policy more unwise or more inconsistent with the maintenance of the Established Church and of the due control of the State over it I cannot conceive. Supposing the clergy sought to do anything against, or without, the authority of Parliament it would be necessary to put down such usurpation and assumption; but when they propose to do nothing of the kind—when they confine themselves to such functions as it is permitted to them to discharge—when, being excluded fromParliament, they have no power to be heard in this assembly, which is unfitted for the discussion of religious and ecclesiastical questions, and is always reluctant to enter upon them—I cannot deem it wise to refuse to them the opportunity of giving expression to their views in a body which is, after all, as much as any other one of the institutions of the country. The hon. Member for Reading talks of their meeting at Willis's Rooms or at Oxford, but such meetings would not organically represent the clergy of the Church of England; and the moment you attempt to put, as has been suggested, a padlock on the clergy, and refuse to them that freedom of speech which is accorded to the General Assembly in Scotland, without being objected to by anybody, and to the voluntary assemblies of every other religious body, with the approbation of the whole nation, you will be, in my opinion, pursuing a course at once impolitic and illiberal. What you want is to keep the Established Church in harmony with the general feeling of the people, and also that due confidence should be felt by the people in the ministers of that Church. How, I would ask, can you better secure that harmony than by having a place where, within safe limits, they may give free expression to their opinions? Do we find that such a privilege has prevented those who may hold whether extreme or moderate views from concurring as a body in support of a liberal measure such as this under discussion? My own opinion is that the policy which allows the members of the Church of England to meet in Convocation, and to give utterance to their sentiments, has been a wise policy, as tending to produce greater moderation of opinion, to soften asperities, and upon the whole to bring the Church more into harmony with public feeling. And, after all, it cannot be said that the Government has given Convocation much power. I believe that all it has asked for has been permission to alter the canon relating to sponsors, which has not yet proved successful; and now they only request leave to express their concurrence in a measure which the House will think both a liberal and a wise one. While their powers are practically restrained within such narrow limits nobody need, I think, fear that any great mischief can be done to the State. I beg my right hon. Friend (Mr. Whiteside's) pardon for omitting one part of the subject. There is no doubt of the legality of these provincial councils in England with the permission of the Crown, but their authority is confined to their own jurisdiction. Nothing that can be done by the synods of York or Canterbury can have the least authority in Ireland. But I entertain no doubt that the action of the provincial Convocations in England has been, in all respects, as legal since, as, with the allowance of the Crown, before the Act of Union.

SIR WILLIAM HEATHCOTE said, the speech of his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General had so well put to the House the arguments on which the Bill was founded, that he should not think it necessary to prolong the discussion if it were not that he desired to say a few words in confirmation of what had fallen from his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State. He had been present at all the deliberations of the Commission down to the time when the preparation of the Report was entered on; he had been a party to the Resolutions on which that Report was founded, and he certainly should have appended his name to it but for the circumstance that when the Report was ready for signature he was in the midst of a serious illness at Rome, which incapacitated him from attending to anything in the way of business, or from having papers submitted to him; and it was not till the present week that he had been able to resume his duties in that House. He was quite ready to accept his share of responsibility for the Report on which the Bill now before the House was founded, and if it had been desirable to prolong the discussion to have stated the grounds of his approval.

MR. LEFROY said, he wished to express his satisfaction at the spirit and tone in which the Bill had been introduced. The right hon. Baronet (Sir George Grey) had so clearly shown that, without removing any one of the protections which the Church was fairly entitled to claim, consideration would be extended by this measure to the views and feelings of scrupulous and conscientious clergymen that it was impossible to resist the impression created by his arguments. He had never heard a more full, clear, or satisfactory exposition than that given by the right hon. Gentleman. Into the question connected with Convocation raised by his right hon. Friend and Colleague (Mr. Whiteside) he would not enter. Accepting the statement of the Attorney General, that no insult or slight had been intended towards the Irish branch of the Established Church, he would only express a hope that on future occasions whenever consultations or deliberations were thought desirable in Convocation, measures would be taken to secure a representation of the Irish branch of the Church, the necessity for whose consent was not denied. This Bill, he hoped, would have the effect of settling questions which had long been debated, and thereby of contributing to the strength and usefulness of that Church which of late years had made such gratifying advances in the affections of the people.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he regretted that the measure or the Report of the Commissioners had not dealt effectually with a question so distressing and discreditable to the Church as that of simony. The spirit of the declaration against practices of this kind was violated every day in the most businesslike manner, and every auctioneer could put a client in the way of obtaining half-a-dozen livings, if necessary, on the shortest possible notice. The Commissioners had not been content to pass the question by, for they had altered the phraseology of the declaration, and, without in any way remedying the evil, had, he feared, laid a new trap for the consciences of the clergy.

Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for Monday next.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS (RETIRING PENSIONS) BILL—[Bill 133.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3 *agreed to*.

Clause 4 (When full Rate may be granted.)

Mr. CAVE said, that he had received a communication from the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane), stating that, owing to a death in his family, he should be unable to move certain Amendments of which he had given notice, and begging him to take charge of them. He would, therefore, with the permission of the Committee, say a few words in explanation of the Amendments taken together, and then state the course which, with the full concurrence of his hon. Friend, he proposed taking with respect to them. The first related to the age at which a Governor should be entitled to a pension; and he certainly thought that when the harrassing nature of the service and the variety of climates to which he was exposed were considered, sixty was a very advanced age for the commencement of a pension. It was besides a premium on age instead of on work, and could not be defended by reference to the superannuations under the Civil Service Act, where the employment was continuous. The next Amendment was the alteration of the term of years from eighteen to fifteen. The explanation of the eighteen was that three separate governments of six years each were to be fulfilled before a claim could be preferred; but it frequently happened that, from ill-health or some accident, or possibly even from some exigency requiring the presence of an able man in another settlement—as in the case of Sir George Grey, for example, who left the Cape for New Zealand when the war broke out—a man might lose a year or two, or even a few months, a deficiency, be it remembered, which could not be made up but by an appointment to another full term of six years, so that to make up eighteen years a man might have to serve twenty-three. He thought, therefore, that while maintaining the principle of the three Governments a year's grace might well be conceded to each. The third and last Amendment was, he thought, the fairest of all. Its object was to provide that colonial service should count for pension as well as that in the permanent Civil Service at home. These colonial posts were really filled up by appointments from home, or when appointments were made by the Governors of the colonies they were made with the sanction and subject to the approval of the Colonial Office. That such service was considered excellent preparation for higher offices was proved by the selection of Governors being frequently made from this source; and hard work in a bad climate certainly gave a better claim upon the country than a comparatively easy and healthy life in Downing Street. These were the Amendments of which he had charge. He had often thought that a more careful distribution of the honours in the gift of the Sovereign might have the effect of drawing into the colonial service men to whom the pecuniary question was of less importance; but so long as it was the custom to confer baronetcies on Lord Mayors on account of events with which they had nothing to do, and knighthood on almost any one who would submit to it, so long must they expect to pay liberally for good men. He had, he thought, shown sufficient justification for these Amendments; at the same time he would rather have the Bill as it stood than none at all, and at so late a period of the Session he was unwilling to do anything which might impede or endanger it. It was, therefore, in no hostile spirit that he put it, and he did so most earnestly, to the Secretary of

State, whether he would not assent to proposals which appeared to him only moderate and just. He moved in line 3, to leave out "sixty," and insert "fifty;" in line 5, to leave out "eighteen," and insert "fifteen;" in line 9, to leave out "permanent."

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Cardwell) would at all events assent to the first of these Amendments, which would reduce the age at which the full rate of pension might be granted from sixty to fifty years. On the former occasion when the Bill was discussed, when he (Sir John Pakington) had expressed an opinion that very few Colonial Governors were to be found to whom the Bill would apply, the right hon. Gentleman (the Secretary of the Colonies) corrected him, and said that eighteen gentlemen would derive benefits from this Bill. But, in private conversation, the right hon. Gentleman admitted that, although there were twenty-eight gentlemen who by their services would be entitled to pensions, only three or four of them had attained the age at which those pensions would accrue. It was clear that many cases of hardship might arise under the Bill as it now stood. It would be very hard, for instance, that a man who had served in a bad climate and returned to this country in bad health at the age of fifty should have to wait for ten years in comparative poverty before he could receive a pension. Difficulties might also arise out of the provision in the fifth clause, which required a service of twelve years before a pension could be granted even at the reduced rate. He himself was acquainted with an instance of a gentleman who, having served as Colonial Secretary in two colonies, was in consequence of his meritorious conduct promoted to a Governorship in the West Indies. There, too, his service was so distinguished that long before the expiry of his government he was transferred to the Mauritius. The consequence was that his term of service amounted to only eleven years, and he was, therefore, disqualified from receiving a pension, while, if he had been less meritorious, he would have remained longer in the West Indies, and would have acquired the right.

Mr. CARDWELL said, that it was a most ungracious task for one in his position to argue against extending the benefits to be given to Colonial Governors under this Bill; but he must at once lay down the principle that the only ground upon which the Bill could be justified to the House of Commons was that its operation was to be prospective. Its object was not to give advantages to gentlemen who had already discharged their duty and received the stipulated reward. Of course the House would include such gentlemen in the provisions of any Act which might be passed when they met their cases; but it was his duty to defend the Bill and its arrangements upon prospective grounds. The case which the right hon. Baronet had suggested with reference to the operation of the limit of sixty years would be met by a provision contained in this clause, that when a gentleman was incapacitated by ill-health contracted in the discharge of his duties he might be allowed to retire at once upon a full pension. The Bill had been framed in entire conformity with the general principle of the Superannuation Acts, the limit of age in which had only recently been reduced from sixty-five to sixty years. As to the proposal to substitute fifteen years service for eighteen, he must remind the hon. Gentleman that the next clause of the Bill provided that any one who had served twelve years might receive a pension amounting to two-thirds of the full rate. With respect to the omission of the word "permanent," the clause would then include not only those who had served in this country, but also those who had served in North America or any other of the colonies of the Crown. Hon. Members must remember that they were now dealing with the Consolidated Fund, and he had already had to contend with those who maintained that Colonial Governors ought not to be pensioned out of the Consolidated Fund. The subject was not free from difficulty. It had been considered by several former Governments, as well as by the present—no measure had ever yet been carried—and he believed that the arrangement now proposed was consistent with justice and precedent. He trusted that hon. Members would not press for further concessions. Whatever rule might be laid down, there would be persons outside of it whom it would be desirable to include. The Bill, however, was an important step in the right direction, and he hoped that hon. Members would allow it to pass in its present shape.

Sir FITZROY KELLY said, he regretted that the Government had confined themselves to so limited a view in reference to these pensions, his own opinion being that there should be some relaxation as to the rule for granting pensions only after sixty years of age. It was an age that most persons who had passed the best part of their lives in the colonies were not permitted to attain. He thought, however, he should best serve the cause of those in whom he was interested by inviting his hon. Friend (Mr. Cave) to accede to the recommendation of the Colonial Secretary. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would take into his consideration the peculiar circumstances connected with colonial service and the office of Governor, and if he could on some future occasion relax a little the conditions of age or length of service he would benefit a meritorious class of officers. He recommended his hon. Friend not to divide, but to leave the matter in the hands of the Government.

Mr. CAVE said, that after the appeal made to him he would not press his Amendments. He had already stated that he would do nothing to endanger the bill, of which he approved, as an instalment, as far as it went. Thanking, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman for such measure of justice as he had been able to propose, he begged to withdraw his Amendments.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 5 to 11, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Secretary of State to determine when an Officer is in Administration of Government).

Mr. MOOR moved at end to add—

> "And for the purposes of this Act the Commission issued under the Great Seal of the Territory of New South Wales for the Government of the district of Port Phillip shall be taken to have constituted the District a Colony."

He said, that his object was to entitle Mr. Latrobe, who had served three years more than the time stipulated to the pension of a Lieutenant Governor, that gentleman having served under the title of Superintendent, and having administered a territory called, not a colony, but a district. He thought if he could show that Mr. Latrobe exercised the same powers that were exercised by a Lieutenant Governor, and that the territory over which he was placed was virtually a colony, that he might appeal with confidence to the Committee to accept his Amendment. About thirty years ago the territory was occupied by a number of persons for their flocks and herds, and held as their individual property. The Governor of Sydney, however, hearing of this, sent down a small military and civil force to take possession of the settlement, but finding it impossible to administer affairs there through the medium of a magistrate, he applied to the authorities at home to send out some person to take charge of the government. In 1839 Mr. Latrobe was appointed by the Colonial Office as Superintendent of what was called the "Settlement of Port Phillip, in the colony of New South Wales," and received instructions to proceed to Sydney in the first instance, to receive his commission, for the reason probably that Port Phillip was then a *terra incognita* to the Colonial Office, and that they had not the means of describing its boundaries. Mr. Latrobe's commission under the great seal of the colony gave him the title of Superintendent, and set out the boundaries of the district over which he was to preside; and he afterwards received a letter to the effect that he was to administer the government with all the powers of a Lieutenant Governor. On the 11th of September, 1839, was received the *Colonial Government Gazette* for New South Wales, containing a proclamation with reference to Mr. Latrobe's appointment, in which occurred these words:—

> "Mr. Latrobe will exercise the powers of Lieutenant Governor, and all officers of the Government and others are hereby required to render him obedience and respect accordingly."

In 1842, an act having passed in this country, giving electoral authority to New South Wales, and also to the district of Port Phillip, it became necessary to alter the boundaries of the latter territory, and a new commission was issued to Mr. Latrobe, in which it was expressly stated that he had the power of a Lieutenant Governor. This was also confirmed in 1856, in a memorandum emanating from the Colonial Office, which professed to give a resumé of the proceedings of the different Australian colonies from their commencement. That the territory itself was virtually a colony was proved by the boundaries set out in the commission and the proclamation, and by the fact that the Supreme Court established for Port Phillip had a jurisdiction of its own. As he had this moment been informed that the Government was willing to accept his Amendment he would not of course trouble the House with any further observations.

Mr. CARDWELL said, he agreed with much that had fallen from the hon. Gentleman. The truth, however, was that the colony of Victoria was for a long time a district under the colony of New South Wales. It began with small proportions, but grew rapidly great. Mr. Latrobe was not, however, in the position of a Governor, inasmuch as there was no Legislature and no Council in the district. The case was one in which it was not possible to make any general rule, and the Committee, if it agreed to the proposition of the hon. Member, must do so on the understanding that it was to apply to Mr. Latrobe's case alone. He was in the position of Governor for most purposes, and he was a most meritorious man. If the Committee took a liberal view of the case he should be happy to accede to it.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he wished to express his great satisfaction at the course taken by the Government. Though Mr. Latrobe only held the position of superintendent, yet in his latter time he had discharged the most difficult duties that could fall upon a Governor. He was practically Governor of Victoria during that period when the advance of the colony exceeded anything in the history of the world; he alluded to the progress caused by the gold discovery. He (Sir John Pakington) held the seals of the Colonial Office at the time, and he could bear testimony to the fact that Mr. Latrobe discharged his duties with great judgment and was well entitled to the consideration of the House.

MR. CHEETHAM said, that Mr. Latrobe entered upon the duties of his office in 1839, with a salary of £800 per annum, which was raised in 1846 to £1,500, and further increased in 1851, when the gold discoveries took place, to £2,000, and in 1852 to £5,000. In 1854 he resigned. Mr. Latrobe's successor entered upon his duties with a salary of £10,000, with house, and £5,000 for table money.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, he thought a proper reward for this gentleman's meritorious service would be to give him a higher office.

MR. CARDWELL said, he was afraid Mr. Latrobe's age unfitted him for the public service.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

MR. LYALL moved the following clause:—

"No person shall be incapable of sitting and voting in Parliament or be liable to any penalty for so doing in consequence of the receipt of a pension under this Act."

He said, that according to the 6th of Anne any person receiving a pension from the Crown during pleasure was liable to a fine of £500 for sitting in Parliament, and was disqualified for so doing; and by an Act in a subsequent reign he was made liable to further penalties. Those Acts were passed in periods of great corruption, and the reasons for them had passed away. It was not fit that persons should be excluded from Parliament in consequence of receiving a pension from the Crown. Colonial Governors would be very useful Members of the House, and he did not see why, when officers of the army and navy were admitted to seats in that House, civil servants should be excluded. He begged, therefore, to move the clause.

MR. AYRTON said, he opposed the clause, on the ground that this was not the time or the occasion for considering this question, which was a very wide one—namely, what ought to be a disqualification for Members of Parliament. At some future time it should come under the consideration of the House. In his opinion it would be necessary rather to restrict than give increased facilities for repeated onslaughts on the Treasury. He was sorry to see such a disposition on the other side to urge Government on every occasion to dilapidate and to waste the resources of the country.

MR. CARDWELL said, the question, as the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had observed, was a very wide one—namely, whether pensioners should sit in the House, and when considered by the House ought to be taken upon its own merits. He saw no reason why a special exemption should be made with respect to those affected by this Bill. It was a fair subject for consideration at a future time, but it was not desirable to consider it in connection with this Bill.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. HENNESSY said, he wished to call attention to the inadequate salaries and superannuations of the outdoor officers of Customs. It would be in the recollection of the House that not along ago this subject had been brought under the notice of the House, and the narrow majority by which the Government was saved on that occasion was owing to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer held out hopes of redressing the grievances complained of. He now rose to ask what the right hon. Gentleman had done to remedy those grievances, to the existence of which so many Members of that House had testified? He wished to call the attention of the House to the case of the outdoor officers of Customs. Those persons, who were engaged in the discharge of most important and responsible duties, were the only civil servants who did not receive an annual increase in their salaries, which were most paltry and inadequate. The merchants of Liverpool had again and again complained that they ran great risk through the smallness of the salaries of these officers, who were exposed to temptation in various ways, having the employment of charging, checking, and making an estimate of the duty on goods of enormous value. In fact many officers of Customs were quietly dismissed for taking perquisites and for not enforcing the Customs regulations, although the officials did not bring them to trial, as they did not wish to make the matters public. In illustration of his contention that the outdoor officers of Customs were the most ill-paid of all civil servants, he would refer to the superannuation allowances to some of them, as set forth in the Return headed "Superannuation, Public Offices," which was laid upon the table in March last by the Government. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not think he was making an invidious selection when he called the attention of the House, in the first place, to the case of John Winter, described in the Return as "Messenger to the Chancellor of the Exchequer," who, having served the public for 27½ years, retired, at the age of 70, with a superannuation allowance of £63 per annum. He would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to contrast the case of his messenger with those of two outdoor officers of Customs—the first of whom, named Bailey, of Newcastle, after twenty-four years' service retired, at the age of seventy-one, with a superannuation allowance of £14 4*s.*; and the second, named Booth, of Liverpool, an outdoor porter, after twenty-six years and ten months' service, retired at the age of forty-nine, in consequence of chronic rheumatism, with a superannuation allowance of £28 18*s.* 2*d.* It must strike the House with surprise that men upon whom so much responsibility lay should receive superannuation allowances so much inferior to that received by the messenger of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The superannuation allowance was the measure of the salary; and if the salaries were freely adjusted, the superannuation allowances would also be freely adjusted. A man named Freeman, of Sunderland, another outdoor Customs officer, after twenty-four years' service, retired from a concussion of the spine upon £23 a year superannuation, and upon inquiry he (Mr. Hennessy) had learnt that the injury was received in the discharge of his duties. At Cardiff, a man named Evans, a tide waiter, was superannuated upon £15 a year; at Harwich, a man named Bannochs, upon £8; at London, a man named Emmet, upon an allowance of £10 13*s.*; and at Belfast, a man named Roberts, upon an allowance of £4 2*s.* He should not ask the Government to do anything further for these poor men, for as they had found it impossible to live upon their superannuation allowances, they had died upon it. The fact was that the men had been literally starved by the Government. These Customs officers did not receive an annual increase to their salaries like other members of the Civil Service. He would contrast with the case of these outdoor officers that of the sorters in the Post Office, whose salaries (those of the first class) rose gradually from £104 to £130; and of the messengers, whose salaries rose from £55 to £104, at the rate of £2 12*s.* a year. The Report recommended that an annual increase in allowance in their salaries should take place, and he therefore begged to express a hope—though from what fell on a former occasion from the right hon. Gentleman not a very confident hope—that he would be prepared to do them that justice which was done to other branches of the Civil Service. Another grievance was that these men were subject to a competitive examination before promotion, so that a man after twenty years' service, found himself placed in competition, perhaps, with a man of three years' service, who was younger and better up in the subjects of examination. Now, high authorities had declared that this was highly improper. A test examination in the duties which a man had been discharging was a different thing; and he also approved of a competitive examination on entering the service. But a competitive examination before promotion was highly unjust to the older officers of the department, and he hoped that that system would be abolished. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley) had already pointed out the injustice of this arrangement, and he hoped it would not be continued by the Government. He sat for an inland county in Ireland, and did not represent a single outdoor officer of customs. These grievances had not only been put forward by the officers themselves, but by a large number of merchants on their behalf.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, that of late years there had been a transposition of duties in this House. Formerly the House watched over expenditure, and were careful to check extravagance on the part of the Government. But now Members rarely objected to expenditure; and this Session members had got up more frequently than he ever remembered to ask why the officers of this or that department were not better paid. Last year it was the Post Office, but the Government then showed that the men were well paid; and this year it was the out-door Department of the Customs, and he had no doubt there was a fallacy behind the hon. Gentleman's arguments on its behalf. When the hon. Member opposite complained of low pensions being given to certain officers, the question was how long they had served, and whether they were not able to maintain themselves in other ways. Of late years our Civil Service establishments had become so large, the number of persons interested in their maintenance and extension was so great, that he began to fear that the virtue of Parliament would suffer. There was a spirit of combination among the civil servants and their friends to keep up the system. The Civil Service now had a gazette of its own, which trumped up the merits of departments, and complained of inadequate pay. Some time since he had come to the conclusion that the staff of the Department of the Poor Law was more than sufficient, and that the secretary to the office might be dispensed with; but the sense of the House was opposed to any change. Some ten days ago there had appeared an article in the *Civil Service Gazette*, which, after trumpeting forth the services and the grievances of the department, proceeded to make a personal attack upon himself, to which he would not further allude. But the writer of that article, whilst he admitted there was room for judicious reforms which would save expense to the country, and raise the service to a better position, seemed to be of opinion that it was only the members of the department themselves who ought to determine what changes should be made. It almost appeared as though the civil servants of the Crown were acting upon Swift's advice to servants, and were claiming to settle the amount of their own salaries. He felt convinced that if such propositions as those of the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) were adopted, the public would protest and demand a total change in the system of paying public servants. He believed that the pay given to persons in the public service was ample. Indeed he was disposed to think it was rather liberal, and that the effect of this was to bring forward candidates of a higher grade in society than those whom it had been intended to appoint. The Government would be neglecting their duty if they did not set their face against this extravagance; for one of the conditions on which they had acceded to office was, that they should look after, examine, and carry reform into the different executive departments of the public service. He hoped the new Parliament, instead of bothering itself about its own reconstruction, would be elected upon the condition of looking after and carrying reforms in the different departments of the executive.

Mr. NEATE said, it might be that though at one time it had been necessary to urge the Government to keep down all profuse expenditure, it was now necessary to protest against what might be called the extravagant economy of his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. With regard to the Post Office, he did not think the observations of the hon. Member for Truro (Mr. Augustus Smith) were applicable; because the result had proved that it was rather a case for proper interference, and was a precedent for carrying out the same principle in other departments. With regard to the Custom House, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Hull (Mr. Clay) had, by means of representations made more than once in that House, induced the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reconsider the case of the officers employed in that department, and somewhat improve their condition. He was of opinion that the Government went a little too far in looking only to the principle of the pay men would take, because, though persons might accept office at a low figure, if after a time they began to compare what they were receiving with the salaries paid to persons employed by private firms, they might arrive at the conclusion that they had made a mistake, and become discontented.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he could not agree with his hon. Friend who had just sat down in respect of what he had described as the extravagant economy of the executive Government. His hon. Friend the Member for Truro had called attention to a very serious consideration, and he was bound to say, even speaking in the presence of his hon. Friend, that though being frequently in contest with him (Mr. Augustus Smith), and having frequently to contest his arguments, whatever might be the responsibility which attached to others, with regard to want of economy in the public expenditure, his hon. Friend was not open to the charge of having swum with the stream. He had been no party to having put forward such demands as that which was now before the House. His hon. Friend the Member for Truro, his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), and other hon. Members whom he might name, had done their duty faithfully as representatives of the people in endeavouring to check and control the public expenditure; and however it might have been his duty to oppose proposals made by those hon. Gentlemen he rendered them only justice when he said thus much as to their personal conduct and the principles which they laid down. Coming to the question before the House, he must say there was something novel in the use which the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) was making of the Appropriation Bill. It was rightly intended that in discussing it the representatives of the people should have every opportunity of checking, narrowing, and controlling the expenditure proposed by Her Majesty's Government, and that the House should have every opportunity of questioning the conduct of the Government in reference to that expenditure; but, as far as his experience went, it was a complete novelty to make use of the Appropriation Bill—the great taxing Act of the Session—for the purpose of contending that the people were not taxed enough. The House were indebted to the hon. Member for this new application of the Appropriation Bill. He begged, however, to deny that in challenging the conduct of the hon. Member in questions of this kind he had ever accused him of bringing it forward for the purpose of gratifying his constituents or with a personal object out of a sordid regard for his own political interests. He had never imputed to him anything so unworthy. He thought, however, that the course which the hon. Member pursued was most mischievous; and he concurred with his hon. Friend the Member for Truro in thinking that if proceedings of this sort should reach a certain point, they would end in important constitutional changes. The hon. Member's main argument in favour of those outdoor officers was founded on the custom of annual increment which he (Mr. Hennessy) held to be the rule in the civil service. It was not true, as far as he knew, that as a rule persons employed in that service were sure of an annual increment to their salaries; but it was a rule that certain salaries were progressive until the persons who received them got out of a certain class, from which time their salaries remained stationary. He thought that an annual increment might be advisable in certain cases; but he was far from thinking it was so wise an arrangement that it was to be assumed to carry an authority, and it was the duty of the Government to say it was the right plan in all cases. In the higher appointments of the Civil Service it was entirely unknown. Neither did it prevail in the lowest grade, and the outdoor officers of Customs were among the lower ranks. [MR. HENNESSY: No; the messengers.] He begged pardon. The outdoor officers performed duties lower than those discharged by the messengers—duties less confidential. But, however that might be, in those lower appointments the principle of annual increment was very little known. Letter carriers, in some instances, were taken into the Post Office at a very early age—as early, he believed as eighteen, and there might be other cases in which an annual increment was a fair principle in consequence of the capacity for duty increasing year by year; but the right hon. Gentleman had not shown that the outdoor officers were persons whose knowledge of duty increased each year. The hon.

Gentleman formed a wrong idea of the public service if he thought that the Government were not entitled, like all other employers, to go into the market and purchase labour at the cheapest rate. He took the case of a man who had been superannuated on £4 a year, and of another who had been superannuated on £8, and he said, "A man cannot live on £8 a year—what a scandal!" The hon. Gentleman wanted any man who had been employed in the dignified appointment of outdoor officer of the Customs—no matter how long or how short might have been his time in the service—to be endowed for ever with the means of supporting himself on his retirement from the office. The hon. Gentleman endeavoured to create an impression that some harsh rule was applied against the gentleman whom he had chosen to take under his protection. On the contrary, one single impartial rule, inflexibly applied, ran through the administration of the Superannuation Act, and it was contrary to the fact to say that one rule was applied, as the hon. Gentleman had attempted to insinuate, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's messenger, for instance, and another to the outdoor officers of the Customs and letter-carriers. Then the hon. Gentleman complained that competitive examination was applied to men who had been for a length of time in the service. But the justification of that was, that the duties to which these men were to be transferred were essentially different from those which they had hitherto performed. It would have been fairer, too, if he had mentioned that competitive examination was not the only means of passing from the position of outdoor officers to that of examining officers, but that half the promotions were given by merit on the selection of the Board of Customs. The hon. Gentleman next asked what he had done to carry out the promise which he had given on a previous occasion, although when he made that promise the hon. Gentleman, confident in the interest which had been used to enlist the feelings of Members in support of his cause, did not attach much value to that promise? But he was bound to say that, although he was most happy to receive from Members—like the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Clay) for instance—such information as their superior knowledge enabled them to give of the feelings of the inhabitants of the places they represented, yet on matters of this kind to yield to Parliamentary pressure as long as he held his present position he should think an abandonment of his duty. The principle he laid down any hon. Member might challenge, and he would defend it, and if the House chose to censure it, it could do so. The promise which he had made was, that in the peculiar cases which had arisen out of the almost reconstruction of the Customs Department which followed the important changes in the Tariff of 1860, any injury that might accrue to officers in respect of the chances of promotion ought to be looked into, and when they assumed a definite and tangible form ought to be made the subject of arrangement. In various instances personal allowances had been made to officers who had been able to show that they had suffered a tangible injury of that kind. It was impossible, however, to lay down a general principle that in any case, however shadowy, where a possible or presumed injury had been suffered, that it should be made the subject of a fixed compensation. The case of 1860 was a peculiar case. As regarded outdoor officers, they had endeavoured to meet it partly by attempting to fill up the body of examining officers from them, and in special cases they had endeavoured to ascertain whether anything like a fair claim to compensation could be established for injury to the chance of promotion. It was not to be supposed that because the services of a person in a higher class had been dispensed with, that all below in that class were to be compensated. In 1860, when a special case arose, it was met by the promotion of some of the outdoor officers in the Customs. The subject was not to be dealt with in the manner the hon. and learned Gentleman would wish. The Customs, from its aggregation of separate establishments into one Board, was a peculiar organization. Each part had more or less rules adapted to its own particular circumstances, which would not bear comparison, and the principle of local promotion was recognized to a great extent. And, therefore, it was only by inquiry, as the cases arose, that they could be dealt with. On that principle the Government had acted, and on that principle they intended to continue to act. With regard to the extra work performed by landing waiters, inquiry had been made, but nothing had as yet occurred to cause him to believe that anything of a serious nature had existed which he could be called upon to notice; but he did not close the door against it. The pay of the different departments, as compared one with another, had for some time engaged the careful attention of the Government, but he was bound to say that he was doubtful whether they could be brought to a standard of comparison. There was no test so good and safe as the willingness of competent persons to accept places under Government, but he did not exclude himself from recognizing the duty of Government to take measures, from time to time according to circumstances and the state of the labour market, for improving all the Government offices; but as yet no case had been brought before them for laying down any general rule of guidance. The hon. Gentleman drew a comparison between the Customs and the other departments, and contended that the Customs were worse paid than the others. That was a matter into which they were inquiring carefully, but he was doubtful whether the allegation could be made good. It was very difficult to draw any comparison between the Customs and the other departments, but as far as the test of the willingness of competent candidates to accept places in the Customs went, nothing had come before him to show that there was any foundation for a general allegation that there was a difference in the rate of remuneration given in the Customs Department and in the other departments of the public service.

Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put and *agreed to*.

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

COUNTY COURTS EQUITABLE JURISDICTION BILL (*Lords.*)—[BILL 150.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. AYRTON moved, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to assimilate the Sheriffs' Court of the City of London in all respects to a County Court. He said, that as the title of the Bill was the County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction Bill, and the Sheriffs' Court was not a County Court, he could not make the Motion in Committee. The Sheriffs' Court was a very peculiar Court. While there were County Courts for every other part of the United Kingdom there was one spot that was exempt from this most beneficent legislation, and that spot was the City of London. When the affairs of the Corporation were examined by a Royal Commission they reported unanimously against the maintenance of this Court. Again, in 1859, when a Private Bill was brought in for the purpose of reforming this Court, the feeling of the House was so strong that it was abandoned. The Committee appointed in 1861 to inquire into the local government of the metropolis also unanimously reported in favour of the abolition of this Court. But, in spite of this unanimity of opinion, the Court continued to exist. While the country was paying £250,000 a year for the administration of justice in the County Courts, this Court was allowed to levy fees to the amount of £5,000 a year and upwards. The salary of the Judge was only £900 a year—a sum far below that paid to the County Court Judges—and there was an accumulation of the fund arising from fees of £8,000. The ultimate destination of this was unknown, though probably it would be made available for some of those festivities of which the Corporation delighted to partake, and which they valued as one of their most desirable franchises. The Bill proposed to give this anomaly a still further recognition. He thought it would be discreditable to the House to go on sanctioning this system. The Bill extended the equitable jurisdiction to the Sheriffs' Court, and he contended that they either ought not to do this, or that, if they did, the other County Court Acts should extend to that Court.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee to assimilate the Sheriffs' Court of the City of London in all respects to a County Court."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he could not agree to the proposed Instruction. If the Government were to propose to overturn the constitution of the Sheriffs' Court and to displace the Corporation of London in reference to it, he feared that they would be making the Bill the occasion for a contest between the Government and the City of London, which would preclude the hope of passing the measure in the present Session. The Bill actually went to some extent in the direction which the hon. Member desired. The Sheriffs' Court was under a somewhat different form and a somewhat different jurisdiction, doing the work of the County Court; and this Bill would give to it the same equitable jurisdiction that it gave to the County Courts. Another year the assimilation would be carried still further. He hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press the Instruction.

MR. AYRTON said, that not wishing to endanger the passing of the Bill, he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Jurisdiction in Equity to be exercised in County Courts in certain Suits and Matters).

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he entertained great doubts whether the jurisdiction proposed to be given to County Court Judges was not far too great, and whether it would not tend to clog the working of their Courts, thereby injuring rather than benefiting the public interests. Were it not so near the close of the Session, he should have felt disposed to move that the maximum of £500 should be reduced to £200.

MR. CHEETHAM said, he should support the clause as it stood, and indeed thought the limit might have been safely fixed at £1,000. Small tradesmen resorted to the County Courts with great confidence, and he thought the jurisdiction ought to be extended to a larger sum.

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR said, he approved the clause, believing that the County Courts had given general satisfaction, and that the public were anxious to have these equitable suits rapidly and economically decided by them.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the extent of the jurisdiction proposed to be conferred by the Bill had been carefully considered, and he believed it might safely be intrusted to the Judges of these Courts. He thought that £500 would be a proper medium.

MR. MURRAY said, he hoped that the limit would not be fixed below £500. If they placed it at a lower amount than that the utility of the measure would be greatly impaired.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that he did not question the competency of the County Court Judges to exercise such a jurisdiction, but feared that the imposition of these new duties upon them would interfere with the small cause business which they now dispatched with so much advantage to the public.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 *withdrawn.*

Clauses 5 to 12 *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Certain Fees to be taken, out of which Judges shall have their Salaries increased to such an Amount as the Fees received will be sufficient to pay to each Judge not exceeding £1,600).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved, in line 20, to leave out from "carried" to end of clause, and insert—

"Paid over to the credit of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the salaries paid out of such Fund to the Judges of the County Courts shall be increased by three hundred pounds a year: Provided always, That the salary of the successor to any Judge who under this Act shall receive a larger salary in the whole than one thousand five hundred pounds, shall not exceed one thousand five hundred pounds: Provided also, That if any Judge heretofore appointed shall resign his office by reason of any permanent infirmity before he shall have received or become entitled to receive the increased amount of salary payable to him under this Act for the full period of five years, any annuity which the Lord Chancellor may recommend to be paid to him upon such retirement shall be calculated with reference to the average amount of salary received or receivable by him for the five years next preceding the date of such retirement, and not with reference to the yearly salary which he shall be entitled to as a Judge of County Court at the time of presenting his petition for the grant of an annuity:"

In margin of clause, substitute for present note—

"Certain fees to be taken and to be paid over to the Consolidated Fund, and the salaries of the Judges to be increased by £300 a year:"

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Judge not obliged to hold Courts in September).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved an Amendment to allow the County Court Judges, with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor, to select any other month than that of September for their annual vacation.

MR. AUGUSTUS SMITH thought the Judges should be required to take their holidays during the period of the long vacation.

MR. MURRAY said, if a County Court Judge wished to take his holyday at any other time than the long vacation he ought to provide a substitute.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he thought the clause might safely be left as he proposed.

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN moved a clause to follow Clause 18—

[Appeal to be made either to the High Court of Chancery or a Vice Chancellor.]

"In any case which may be the subject of an appeal under this Act in causes arising within the

County Palatine of Lancaster, the appeal may, at the option of the party appealing, be made either to the High Court of Chancery or a Vice Chancellor thereof, or to the Court of Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster, or the Vice Chancellor thereof; and that in case of an appeal to the Court of Chancery for the said County Palatine or the Vice Chancellor thereof, the order on such appeal shall have the same effect as if it had been made by a Vice Chancellor of the High Court of Chancery."

He said, that this was the first time the Courts of Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster had been treated otherwise than the Superior Courts of Westminster Hall. The object of his clause was to preserve to the former the rights which they had hitherto enjoyed.

Mr. POTTER said, that there was an exemption clause already by which all the rights of the Courts of Stannaries in the Duchy of Cornwall were reserved. If that were done in Cornwall why should it not be done also for the Chancery Courts of the County Palatine of Lancaster, the business of which was a hundred-fold greater than that of all the Courts of Stannaries?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the Bill gave no new jurisdiction to the Courts of Stannaries or took anything away. At present there was an appeal from the decision of the Vice Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster to the High Court of Chancery. If the clause were agreed to the effect would be to deprive the mercantile community of Liverpool and Manchester of the rights of ultimate appeal which they now possessed, inasmuch as the decision of the Vice Chancellor would, under the Act, be final. This clause gave the Court of Chancery of the County Palatine official jurisdiction; and he did not see any reason why the suitors there should be compelled to put up with an inferior equitable jurisdiction.

Mr. C. TURNER said, the Attorney General was entirely wrong in thinking that the people of Lancashire would not be satisfied without going to the High Court of Chancery. The truth was, they did not want any power to appeal to the Courts in London, but to have appeals decided in the cheapest Court, and in the speediest manner. He believed the mercantile interests both of Liverpool and Manchester were quite satisfied with the decisions of the gentleman who presided over the Chancery Court at Liverpool.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that this was but a repetition of the attempts so often made to annihilate these Courts. Their defenders had the disadvantage of having to meet the lawyers of Westminster Hall, who were always trying to bring the Courts of the Palatine up to London. These attempts had hitherto always been successfully resisted; and he trusted the hon. and learned Gentleman would agree to the clause.

Mr. AYRTON said, he wished to suggest that the words "at the option of the party appealing" should be altered so as to give both parties the option.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that he would assent to this Amendment.

Mr. CHEETHAM said, the Attorney General need not fear the Courts here being disturbed with many appeals by Lancashire men to the prejudice of their own just, epuitable, and economical Courts.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he thought it possible to carry theoretical objections too far, and he therefore would consent to the insertion of the clause.

Mr. C. TURNER said, that on behalf of the people of Manchester, who would naturally wish to have recourse to the local court, he must oppose the Amendment proposed on the ground that it would render the clause valueless, inasmuch as one of the parties would be sure to object.

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Preamble *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 236.]

INDEMNITY BILL—[Bill 234.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time." (*Mr. Peel.*)

Mr. HADFIELD moved that it be read a second time that day three months. He said it had been declared by a noble Lord for whom hon. Members at the other side of the House had great respect (Earl Derby), that the particular declaration pointed at by this Bill, as a protection to the Established Church, was not worth the paper on which it was written so far as it professed to accomplish that object. It was kept up merely as a badge of predominance, and for the purpose of insulting and marking off millions of Englishmen as serfs. The indemnity was sought upon the assumption that persons were ignorant of the law requiring them to take it, were absent from the country, or for other reasons of that sort. Among the persons, however, supposed to be ignorant of the law were officials no less exalted than the Attorney General and Commander of the Forces. He had introduced a Bill to obviate the necessity of taking the oath to which this Bill referred, and that Bill had been agreed to by that House six times; and after all that, to his great surprise the Bill had been rejected by the other House. The great Conservative leader in the other House had summoned the Peers to reject the measure. By this Indemnity Bill the Ministers passed a measure for themselves which they refused to their fellow-subjects. That was a miserable exhibition of legislation. It was quite time to put an end to this system of things. If the other House would not repeal the Oath's Act they ought to insist on the oath being taken by all to whom the Act applied, and the House ought to reject this Indemnity Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Hadfield.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. PEEL said, that if the Bill proposed by the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) had become law—as he wished it had—it would still have been necessary to pass the annual Indemnity Bill, which was applicable not only to the declaration substituted for the old sacramental test, but also to the consolidated oath which had taken the place of the oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and supremacy. The only difference, if the Bill of the hon. Member had passed, would have been that there would have been no reference in the Indemnity Bill to the subject of the declaration referred to. If they could not repeal the law as the hon. Member wished, the next best thing was to suspend its operation. He therefore hoped the House would allow the Bill to pass into law. With regard to the clauses of which the hon. Member for Sheffield had given notice, he could offer no opinion till he had an opportunity of seeing them.

MR. HENNESSY said, he thought the House instead of passing an Indemnity Bill ought honestly to repeal some of the Acts to which the Indemnity Bill related, and which rendered it necessary. One, in particular, an extraordinary one, the 2nd of Anne, c. 6, was entitled "An Act to prevent the further growth of Popery;" and stated that "some of Her Majesty's subjects in extreme sickness and decay of their reason and senses are persuaded and perverted from the Protestant religion;" and it provided, that all persons so persuaded should suffer very severe penalties unless they made declarations in accordance with that Act. Without doing anything invidious, he might say that there were hon. Gentlemen in the House who would be exposed to all the penalties of that Act, the severest of which, no doubt, would be the taking of the declaration. Another clause of the Act provided, that no "Popish" tenant should hold land, except at a certain exceptionally high rental. As he did not believe that any one would venture to enforce that Act, if this Bill was not passed he should support the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield.

MR. BRIGHT said, that the effect of the clauses, of which his hon. Friend (Mr. Hadfield) had given notice, would be to render an annual Indemnity Bill unnecessary, by abolishing the declaration which the law now required to be made. If the Government would take charge of a measure containing such clauses perhaps certain people in another place would allow it to pass. There was a great terror in that place of giving a triumph to the Dissenters represented by his hon. Friend. Whether that feeling was worthy of a great House, or was a very mean one, he would leave the public to determine; but if the Government would take up the measure it would go into the other House under auspices which would render it in the eyes of some people more respectable, and possibly it might pass. If the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Peel) would give a pledge that the Government would adopt that course—and probably he would do so, as many things could be done just before a general election—his hon. Friend would not think it necessary to divide the House. As it was, he was anxious to carry a reform, which he said was desired by millions of his fellow-countrymen, and he was, therefore, fairly at liberty to take every opportunity of insisting upon that being done in favour of which they decided in six successive Sessions.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 32; Noes 18: Majority 14.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read 2°, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

[BILL 227.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Motion that the Preamble be postponed,

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH moved that the Chairman report Progress.

SIR MICHAEL BEACH said, he would not oppose the Bill, but he hoped that the Government would next Session introduce a more general and comprehensive measure on this subject. Many roads were unjustly and inequitably dealt with by this Bill. The principle upon which it was based was that of putting the charges of the turnpike roads upon the parishes through which they ran, according to the mileage of the roads. He trusted that the Government would next Session bring in a Bill to place the maintenance of these roads either upon the highway district or upon the county, so as to make the inhabitants of the towns pay their proportion of the expense.

COLONEL PENNANT said, the House was aware that there were a great many turnpike trusts the local Acts with respect to which had expired. These trusts varied in almost every case with regard to the circumstances under which they were continued—the debt, the manner in which it had been incurred, the income, and the liabilities of the parishes through which the roads passed. Each year a Bill was introduced to continue the trusts, with the exception of those which were placed in the schedules. It was much better to leave the selection of the road trusts which were to be placed in the Continuance Act to the Home Office than that an individual Member, pressed perhaps by his constituents, should move to insert any particular trust in the schedule.

MR. T. G. BARING said, it would, no doubt, be exceedingly desirable if the House could see its way to some general legislation for the abolition of these trusts, but it was perfectly impossible to do so at the present time. In every case which came before the Home Office great care was taken to inquire as to whether the trusts ought to be abolished, so as not to throw any extraordinary liability on particular parishes.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, be believed that every Motion made was recorded by the Clerk of the Committee. He should be glad to know what record was made of the Motion that these three Bills be referred to the same Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the Order of the House was that the three next Orders should be referred to the same Committee.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH: Who is recorded as the Mover of the Motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not given.

Motion *withdrawn.*

Clause 1 (Continuance of Acts, except 7 G. 4. c. lxxxv., 7 G. 4. c. cxxv., 7 & 8 G. 4. c. vii., 9 G. 4. c. cviii., 1 W. 4. c. viii., 3 W. 4. c. liii., 3 W. 4. c. lxi., 3 & 4 W. 4. c. c., 2 Vict. c. xiv., 5 Vict, c. xlv., 6 & 7 Vict. c. cviii., 13 & 14 Vict. c. lxxxv).

MR. LOCKE said, he had to move an Amendment, the object of which he stated to be to introduce the Lower Road from Greenwich to Woolwich into the Bill, contrary to a promise made in the last Session by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir George Grey), that the trust should, in the present Session, be decided upon by a Select Committee, along with the New Cross Road, the Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, and Deptford Road, and the Surrey and Sussex Road. It had been introduced into the Bill for the purpose of continuing it. That was a course directly contrary to the arrangement made, and he was fully justified, therefore, in taking the sense of the House upon the subject. The Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Road Trust having been given up, and a rate levied for the support of the road, complaint was necessarily made of the invidious distinction. It was no answer to the claim that a toll should be taken off that there was a small debt existing. A proposal was made by the deputation to the Home Office for paying off this debt, but nothing had been done. The inhabitants of Bermondsey and Rotherhithe, where the trusts had been abolished, complained of having to pay eightpence in the pound to maintain their roads while a turnpike was kept up which interfered with their trade in supplying Woolwich with goods. The debt upon the trust was only £2,000. At the north side of the river a debt of £20,000 had not stood in the way of a trust being put in the schedule. If the House had come to a resolution, that within a certain metropolitan area road trusts should be abolished, that resolution should be adhered to.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 4, to add, at the end of the Clause, the words, "also an Act fifth George the Fourth, chapter fifty-six, for repairing the Lower Road from Greenwich to Woolwich, in the county of Kent."—(*Mr. Locke.*)

MR. T. G. BARING was not aware that the House had decided that there should be no turnpike trusts in the metropolis regardless of existing interests. The roads on the north of the Thames had only been thrown on the rates when the debts had been paid off. No doubt, the Archway and Kentish Town Trust was abolished, notwithstanding the existence of a long debt, but in that way a proprietory road could not be quoted as a precedent in this case. The trust to which the hon. Gentlemen referred had a *bonâ fide* debt of between £2,000 and £3,000, the interest had been revised by the Home Office within a short time, and the debt was being paid off at the rate of £500 per annum, so that it would be liquidated in about four years. To abolish this trust now would be a confiscation of the property of those who had lent their money upon its security. The Home Office were anxious to relieve the metropolis from road tolls, and the south side of London had been so relieved to a great extent. The three trusts had been put on the schedule which were free from debt; the other trust was not. The gate between Greenwich and Woolwich could not be said to be a tax on the inhabitants of Camberwell.

MR. LAYARD said, that as representing the borough of Southwark, he hoped the hon. Gentleman (Mr. T. G. Baring) would re-consider his decision. He had certainly understood, on the occasion of the deputation to the Home Office, that the toll should be abolished. There had been a promise that the Bill should this Session be referred to a Select Committee. The inhabitants of Southwark and the inhabitants of Woolwich had petitioned against the Bill. The toll was a source of great inconvenience to his constituents.

MR. COX said, that there was no good case for maintaining these tolls any more than there had been for maintaining those upon the north side of the Thames. Then private interests were concerned, and yet the tolls were abolished.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, it had been conceded that one of the greatest impediments to traffic in the metropolis was the existence of these tolls. If persons lent their money on the security of an Act of Parliament the term of which had expired he thought then the public interest should be paramount to that of creditors.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 18; Noes 14: Majority 4.

And it appearing that 40 Members were not present:

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:—House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, June 23, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * (211); Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * (212); Rochdale Vicarage * (213); Naval Discipline Act Amendment * (214); Sugar Duties and Drawbacks * (195).

Second Reading—Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * (168); Navy and Marines (Wills) * (169); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) * (183); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) * (184); Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions * (177); Naval and Marines (Property of Deceased) * (176); National Gallery (Dublin) * (196); Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment * (199).

Select Committee—Report—Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) * (144).

Committee—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * (180); Malt Duty * (181); Harbours Transfer * (182); Kingstown Harbour * (188); Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * (189).

Report—Partnership Amendment (162); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * (180); Malt Duty * (181); Kingstown Harbour * (188); General Post Office (Additional Site) * (124); Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment * (205); Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * (189).

Third Reading—Lunatic Asylum Act (1853), &c. Amendment * (160); Railway Debentures, &c. Registry * (191); Admiralty, &c. Acts Repeal * (165); Admiralty Powers, &c. * (166); Dockyard Ports Regulation * (167); Mortgage Debentures * (206); Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment * (106); Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment * (136); Procurators (Scotland) * (207).

THE CONSUL AT SARAWAK.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE asked the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in sanctioning the appointment of Mr. Richardson as Consul at Sarawak, under the exequatur of Sir James Brooke, Her Majesty's Government intended to recognize Sir James Brooke as an independent Sovereign in Borneo?

EARL RUSSELL said, that application having been made for the appointment of a Consul by the Rajah of Sarawak, he felt it his duty to ascertain first whether Sir James Brooke had been placed in an independent position by the Sultan of Borneo; and, secondly, whether, if he had, there was any objection to the appointment of a Consul in his dominions. It appeared to be clear from the papers which were submitted to him that an independent position had been granted by the Sultan of Borneo to Sir James Brooke; and the Law Officers of the Crown, upon being consulted, gave their opinion that there was no objection to the appointment of a Consul at Sarawak. He therefore advised Her Majesty to appoint Mr. Richardson to be Consul at that place.

STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, there was a subject of considerable importance which he wished to bring before their Lordships—he referred to the state of Public and Private business before Parliament. In respect to the Public business, it was pretty nearly concluded. In the other House the Appropriation Bill had been read a second time last evening, and there was no need that the proceedings of Parliament should be protracted much longer in regard to Public business. With regard to Private business, it was desirable that some mode should be adopted by which parties interested in Private Bills might not be put to inconvenience. It was obvious that if any of those Bills met with any determined opposition they would occupy a considerable length of time, and Parliament in that case would be obliged to sit without having any Public business before it. He thought, however, that if the Session were prolonged to suit the convenience of these parties the country, which was expecting an immediate dissolution, would think itself hardly dealt with. He had ascertained that at that moment there were sixty-four Private Bills which had not received a second reading. How many of those were opposed or were not it was impossible for him to say. But what he wished now to do was to call the attention of the Chairman of Committees to the state of Private business, in order that he might make himself master of the facts some day next week, and be able to inform their Lordships in how short a time the House might be able to dispose of them. It would be for their Lordships' consideration whether they should, under the circumstances, follow the same course as that on a former occasion—in 1857 and 1859—namely, to pass a Resolution by which parties having Private Bills might be enabled to take them up in the ensuing Session of Parliament at the stage at which they were left now, or whether it would be desirable to adopt any other course with respect to the Private business before the House. He thought it right to say at the same time that their Lordships were not to blame for anything that might have occurred in respect to Private business. On the contrary, he believed that their Lordships had disposed of all the Private Bills that had been sent up as expeditiously as could be reasonably expected.

Lord REDESDALE said, he hoped he should be in a position, probably on Monday, certainly on Tuesday, to speak pretty confidently as to the number of Private Bills that would be opposed in Committee. He did not think that there were quite so many as might be expected. He had seen some of the agents that day, and they all desired very much to proceed with their Bills. He had certainly a great objection to the plan of suspending Bills. It had been done on three occasions; but two of these—in the instances of 1857 and 1859—afforded no precedent for the adoption of a similar course in the present case; in 1857 the Resolution was adopted by the House on the 20th March, and the dissolution took place on the 21st. Therefore, in that Session, it would be observed, that all the Bills came to the New Parliament precisely in the same state as they would have done if the Session had begun in February; and the only change was that whatever had been done before that period was done as if Parliament had just met. In 1859 the dissolution took place just a month later—namely, on the 23rd of April; but still in that case the Bills all stood on the Notices for the year. Therefore there was no objection in that case, and very little inconvenience would have arisen even if the House had decided that the Bills should commence *de novo*. In 1847 the business before the House was extremely heavy, and as early as the 3rd June a Select Committee was appointed by that House to consider the subject. The Committee recommended that an option should be given to the parties to suspend any Bills they might have before Parliament if they thought proper. That Resolution having been adopted by the House of Commons on the 10th June, the parties were required to give notice on the 18th June whether they wished their Bills to be suspended or not. Now the option was very different on the present occasion. On the occasion of 1847 he entered a protest against proceeding at all with the Resolution, on the ground that it was very objectionable that one Parliament should bind another. He thought that the principle was a bad one. And there was this objection to it, that whereas in some instances competing schemes might have been rejected, and one Bill adopted in preference to another, it was in the power of those persons who had promoted those schemes to bring in improved schemes of the same character in the next Parliament, and the parties to them might demand to have their schemes heard in connection with the others. At the same time the House was placed in a great difficulty, the public business being nearly at an end, to finish the private business as soon as it was desired, although he did not think it would take very long to dispose of the private business in the ordinary way. Under these circumstances he must leave the matter in the hands of the House for their decision. The House would sit to-morrow, and he should then move the following notice on Standing Order 179, sec. 1 :—

> "That this day shall be considered as a sitting day with respect to any petition praying to be heard upon the merits against any Bill mentioned in either of the two classes of Private Bills, except to any such Bill which was read a first time on Friday last."

The effect of that Order would be, that all petitions to be heard against Private Bills must be presented on Monday next.

The Earl of DERBY said, he thought it unfortunate, when a course of so unusual a character was proposed, that some notice should not have been given to their Lordships of the intention to submit a Resolution of this kind in order that the parties immediately interested in the Bills to be affected by it might have an opportunity given them of stating their objections to such a proceeding if they thought fit to do so.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, that he had not proposed any Resolution—he had merely made an inquiry of the Chairman of Committees as to the state of private business, and suggested whether it might not be expedient to follow the same course as that adopted under similar circumstances.

The Earl of DERBY repeated, that the House ought not to be called upon to pronounce an opinion upon a question so important without previous notice. The proposition, or rather the suggestion, of the noble Lord was, that the House should allow all Private Bills not disposed of by Committees of their Lordships' House to stand over until next Session, and then to be taken up from the stage in which they now were. The noble Lord had cited certain instances in which he said that course had been adopted. But he (the Earl of Derby) doubted that these cases were analogous to the present position of Parliament. One of the cases was that of 1859, when it had become indispensable that a dissolution should take place in the spring of the year, owing to the then state of parties, and it was therefore desirable that some provision should be made in order to prevent the private business then before Parliament being unnecessarily affected; but, in the present case, there was no reason why Parliament should be dissolved or prorogued before the business was gone through in the ordinary way. It might be very convenient to the Government, and to the Members of the other House of Parliament, that they should not be kept a long time in suspense, and that the elections should take place without delay; but that was not a sufficient reason for the adoption of such a course as that suggested—a course that would necessarily expose the parties immediately interested in those Bills to much inconvenience. He did not know what the state of the private business was; but he had not heard any reason assigned for the adoption of so unusual a course as the prorogation of Parliament, without any apparent cause, at the end of June or the beginning of July, and to call upon the parties promoting those Private Bills to suspend their proceedings in respect to them now, and to resume them in the next Session, when a new Parliament would be assembled. With regard to the suggestion made by his noble Friend, he (the Earl of Derby) wished to know whether he was to understand by the notice which the Chairman of Committees had given that he intended that their Lordships should meet to-morrow to consider the subject.

Lord REDESDALE answered in the affirmative.

The Earl of DERBY said, all he wished to know from Her Majesty's Government was, whether they meant to propose to-morrow any specific course of proceeding founded upon any specific grounds, and if such was their intention he was anxious to know what those grounds were?

LORD CHELMSFORD said, that the noble Lord opposite stated that the public business would probably be soon disposed of, and that the public would become impatient if the House should continue sitting after that time, and he suggested a mode of disposing of the remaining private business. But he must remind their Lordships there was still some public business of much importance to be transacted in the shape of a great number of appeals that were yet to be heard. Now, it would be a great hardship to the parties concerned in those appeals if Parliament, in consideration of what it called the public business being disposed of, were to be prorogued before there was any absolute necessity for such a course. He, therefore, entered his protest, on behalf of the parties whose cases were ready to be heard, against the proposed unnecessary prorogation of the House before the proper time.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, he had merely made the suggestion to his noble Friend for the purpose of obtaining information as to the position of the private business before their Lordships' House; and he mentioned the course adopted by Parliament under similar circumstances on former occasions, and left it to their Lordships to consider what would be the most desirable means to take for meeting the difficulty in which Parliament was placed.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE said, that the noble Lord had stated that, seeing that the private business would occupy a long time if they proceeded to dispose of it in the ordinary way, he thought it was extremely desirable to close the Session at once. He (the Duke of Montrose) could not assent to so unusual a course being adopted without some strong reason being shown for its necessity. Why, he would ask, was there this great hurry? The noble Lord opposite spoke of the natural end of the Session, but that natural end was usually the middle of August, and not the end of June. There could be no good reason for imposing upon parties who had had their Bills before the House of Commons for six weeks or two months the hardship and inconvenience of having further proceedings suspended until next year. The proposition of the Government was a monstrous one, and was not justified by any absolute necessity.

EARL RUSSELL thought that, according to precedent, after the Appropriation Bill had been introduced, after all the Votes in Supply had been taken, and after all public business had been disposed of, it was not usual to delay the prorogation simply for the sake of private business and appeals. Such was not the case in 1859. The public knew that the present Parliament had been in existence for six years, and that it was not usual to continue seven years, and therefore the general expectation was that there would be a speedy dissolution. The promoters of Private Bills were, therefore, quite aware of the chance to which they were exposed.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, that the delay suggested was not one of weeks but of days. The case of 1859 was not applicable here, because then it was absolutely necessary to know at once what was the opinion of the country, and then very little inconvenience was produced to the promoters of Private Bills, because they knew that, as the dissolution must necessarily be followed by the meeting of the new Parliament, within forty days their business might be resumed. But now they were told by an authoritative journal, *The Times*, that Parliament would not meet until February; so that there would be a recess of seven months, during which time all those interested in private business and appeals would be left in a state of anxiety and suspense.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE.

PETITION.

LORD LYTTELTON, in presenting a Petition of Clergy and Laity of the Church of England for the increase of the Episcopate, said, the petition was so respectably and numerously signed by about 1,500 persons, clergy and laity in about equal proportions, that he had felt bound to give notice of his intention, in order that in presenting the Petition he might draw the attention of their Lordships to the subject of its prayer. He had not intended to say more than a few words upon the subject; but, as the most reverend Primate had requested him to delay the presentation until he and some of his right rev. Brethren could be in their places that there might be the opportunity for a full expression of opinion on the subject, he thought it would be expected that he should do a little more. He would, therefore, briefly advert to the few events of importance which had occurred since last he alluded to the subject. One of those events was the fact that both Houses of Convocation had concurred in opinion that an increase of the Episcopate was desirable, and the Upper House had gone so far as to specify a certain number of new sees which it was desirable should be created, and addressed the Crown to that effect. Thus the opinion of both Houses of Convocation had been in accordance with the views which he had expressed on a former occasion. Some time since a journal, highly distinguished for its zeal in the cause of the Church, had said that Convocation ought to be suppressed, because it did nothing, but confined itself to discussion, and the public cared nothing for what was said in Convocation. The first objection was natural, but not, therefore, reasonable. They first debarred Convocation from going further than discussion, and then sneered at it because it did nothing but discuss. Whether any one cared for what Convocation said was, no doubt, a question of opinion and observation. His own belief was that people did care, and much more than formerly, for the expression of the opinions of Convocation, and that it was precisely for that reason that those who desired that there should be no action by the Church of England, except as a branch of the State, were jealous of the degree of influence which Convocation had obtained. The Upper House had recommended the formation of three additional sees. One was to be the division of the see of Exeter by the severance from it of the county of Cornwall. So far, it was connected with the other main event to which he had alluded—the presentation of an address from the county of Cornwall to one of Her Majesty's Ministers, in favour of a bishop for that county being appointed. He believed that neither the address of Convocation nor the memorial from Cornwall went into the question of how the object should be attained. He did not complain of any Government for declining to undertake to bring in such a measure of its own motion. He himself had presented a petition from the diocese of Winchester in favour of a subdivision of that diocese; but he then expressed his opinion, which he still retained, that it was for those who desired to see such a measure carried into effect in their own district to indicate the means to be provided, and to lay the details specifically before Government and Parliament. All these addresses had suggested that one great means of endowment for the new sees should be looked for in the fund in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which used to be called the Episcopal Fund, but which was now merged in the general funds of that body. That was certainly a reasonable suggestion in itself, but yet he did not advocate its adoption in the present state of public feeling. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were now becoming for the first time in their existence a popular body, because they seemed likely to be able really to deal with the spiritual destitution of the country, by increasing out of their general funds a large number of small endowments to a fair and reasonable amount; and he did not maintain that that process could now be interrupted. He certainly could not agree in the answer which had been given by the Home Secretary, or by some clerk in his Office, to these addresses, that railways and the penny post had greatly diminished whatever necessity might have existed for an increase of the Episcopate. It was a wonder he had not added telegraphs, elastic bands, and envelopes. He was ashamed to answer such an argument. Railways of course had increased the facilities of getting about for bishops as well as for everybody else; it did not take so long to get from Exeter to the Land's End as it used to do; but, at the same time, they brought more people to see and consult with the Bishops, and thus increased their work. Had any noble Lord found that the penny post had diminished the labour of correspondence? It made it easier and cheaper, but it multiplied it tenfold. Such an answer was totally unworthy of the subject. Some time ago the late Sir James Graham, in the other House of Parliament, had given a description of a bishop. He said he had to preside at certain committees and to answer certain letters, and that was all. This Grahamic model of what a dignitary of the Church of England ought to be had excited a good deal of remark. But the true theory of a bishop's duties was that he had the cure of souls of the whole of his diocese. There were Bishops who had a personal and accurate knowledge of every parish in their diocess, who had been in them all, could tell what was going on in them, and knew many of the leading people in them. Some time ago he had seen a complaint from a layman in the diocese of Oxford, in a pamphlet, that he could not go anywhere in the diocese but that the Bishop had been before him; he could not get anywhere out of the reach of ecclesiastical activity. No amount of railways or other accommodation of that kind could increase the powers of the human mind or facilitate the work of a Bishop in dealing with the souls of his diocese. In a diocese like London, where the population was increasing at the rate of 40,000 or 50,000 souls a year, facilities of this kind were not of the slightest advantage and no one could suppose that it was possible for one man to perform the duties of such a diocese in a satisfactory manner. On the general question he had really nothing to add to what he had said formerly. He was not about to attempt again to legislate on the subject, certainly not without receiving assurances of greater support, whether from open enemies or professed supporters, than he had received before. He considered that nobody could legislate on the subject but the Government; but he hoped that serious consideration would be given to the subject, and that the result would be some practical move in the direction pointed at in this petition.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he felt very much indebted to the noble Lord for having brought forward this subject, and was only sorry that the noble Lord did not propose to submit a legislative measure to their Lordships. When he had requested the noble Lord to postpone the presentation of the Petition until his Episcopal Brethren could be present, it was not in the hope of being able to bring forward any additional arguments in favour of the increase of the Episcopate, for, in truth, the arguments had been used so frequently that they would not bear repeating, but because he thought the subject was one deserving of the fullest discussion. It seemed to him very hard that while the population of England had increased four-fold since the time of Henry VIII., every attempt to increase the number of bishops should meet with such opposition. Though it was his earnest wish that the most perfect harmony should exist between the clergy and the Government, of whatever party it might be composed, he could not refrain from saying that the discouragement which had been given by the Government to these efforts had created the greatest disappointment and dissatisfaction. He wished to express the opinion, most emphatically, that in places where the population had multiplied in an extraordinary degree enlarged episcopal supervision should be supplied. As to finding endowments, undoubtedly there were some difficulties to be encountered. He was far, however, from thinking that by devoting a certain proportion of the ecclesiastical revenues under the management of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to the endowment of new sees they would be withdrawing from the effectiveness of the funds applied to the relief of spiritual destitution. On the contrary, they found that where a large diocese was divided there followed a large increase in the means provided for supplying spiritual need. If he wished to employ a still more striking exemplification of this truth he should find it in the case of the colonial dioceses. Let their Lordships endeavour to realize what were the duties cast upon the Bishop of Calcutta when the see was first founded, and when his authority extended over the whole of the peninsula of India, Ceylon, and the whole of Australia. Was it possible to suppose that there would have been the increase of churches, of clergy, and of souls gathered into the fold of Christ's Church which they had witnessed, unless there had been successive divisions of a diocese formerly so vast? The Address presented by Convocation prayed for the erection of only three new dioceses—Bodmin or Truro, Southwark and St. Albans—a plan of most moderate dimensions when the great spiritual necessities of the country were taken into consideration. A great anxiety on the subject existed in the districts themselves, and the document which had been entrusted to the noble Lord was signed by persons varying very much in some of their theological views, and comprised representatives of almost every shade of political opinion, and he should be very glad to see legislative provisions introduced for carrying into effect the prayer of the Petition.

EARL RUSSELL said, that as the most rev. Prelate had made an allusion to the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in that matter, he wished to observe that they had not shown themselves indifferent to the wants of the Church in respect to episcopal supervision. He might refer to the creation of the Bishoprics of Ripon and Manchester in support of his assertion.

There were difficulties in the matter which could not be overlooked, and which it was impossible for them altogether to control.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY hoped their Lordships would consider the question for a few minutes before they gave their assent to the prayer of the petition. With every respect for the episcopal bench, there was a higher and a holier interest to be considered—the high and holy interest of the mass of the people. If there was one thing more than another which the people of England believed they had a right to, it was the full development of the parochial system; and yet, except in the rural parishes, that system was at present a delusion. As far as the great towns were concerned, certainly it was not carried into effect. Their Lordships knew that the parochial system was not carried into effect owing to the want of funds, and the most strenuous efforts of the friends of the Church ought in the first instance to be devoted to supplying that great deficiency. The Committee of 1858 moved for by the Bishop of Exeter, speaking in their Report of church accommodation, and referring to the statement in the Census that 58 per cent was sufficient for the entire community, said—

> "Looking at the actual provision made in London, considered in the large and popular sense as the metropolis, it appears that the population being 2,362,236, and the sittings actually provided for by all denominations being only 713,561, or 29·7 per cent, no fewer than 669,514, or not much less than half of the whole number, are required to raise the sittings to 58 per cent of the population."

Their Lordships knew what was being done in London to extend the parochial system, and there was scarcely a diocess in the kingdom in which some such efforts were not made. For instance, in the diocese of Rochester, it is so stated in an appeal now in circulation, out of 601 benefices, 128 were without a residence for the pastor, and 181 yielded an income of less than £200. Under these circumstances he deprecated any proposal for taking from the Episcopal Fund in the hands of the Commissioners money for the proposed new bishoprics.

Lord LYTTELTON explained that he had not advocated practically the taking of the necessary money from the fund alluded to by the noble Earl, though it might be his own private opinion that the money ought to come from that source.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY said, he had a right to comment on the proposition, even though the noble Lord had not actually called upon the House to adopt it. He would ask their Lordships to bear in mind the private efforts which were being made for the extension of the parochial system. There was the Church Pastoral Aid Society, for the appointment and payment of additional curates in populous parishes, which Society raised with difficulty £40,000 a year. There was the Curates' Aid Society, having the same object in view, and raising about the same amount annually. He ventured to say that there was scarcely a day on which each of their Lordships did not receive one or more letters applying for assistance to Churches. Their Lorpships were aware of the judicious exertions being made by the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Winchester to meet the spiritual destitution of their respective dioceses. Other right rev. Prelates were working in the same direction; but he believed that it would be with difficulty, if at all, they would succeed in raising the necessary amount from private bounty. He remembered Bishop Blomfield saying that he wanted for London alone 250 additional clergy, which, at £200 a year for each, would require an outlay of £50,000 annually. And surely 1,000 additional clergy would be wanted for the Provinces, a demand which, at the same rate, would amount in the whole to £250,000 a year. He would direct their Lordships' attention to a passage in the fourth Report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It was in these words—

> "That the property and revenues to be vested in and paid to the said Commissioners, under these propositions, be (after a due consideration of the wants and circumstances of the place in which they accrue) applied, except as herein specified, to the purpose of making additional provision for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is most required."

He would admit, but only for sake of argument, that the episcopal service was insufficient. Better it should be so than that the parochial service should be insufficient. If they could not have an increased episcopacy without spiritual destitution, let them not have it. The late Archbishop of Canterbury had said that he should not be satisfied till he had a fold for every sheep, and a shepherd for every fold. He thought his Grace was right; and he now protested against this petition for an extension of the Episcopacy at the expense of the parochial system.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD gave the noble Earl who had just sat down (the Earl of Shaftesbury) credit for the purest motives in the conclusion to which he had come on this subject, and he agreed with him that this question was to be considered with reference to what was for the benefit of the whole of the people. The noble Earl seemed to represent that the petition had been brought forward in the interest of the episcopal order; but that order existed only for the benefit of the mass of the people, and consequently it might be that, in consenting to the increase of the episcopacy, their Lordships would be promoting the interests of the poor and of the mass of the people. Therefore an assertion that their Lordships ought to have regard to the wants of the people was no argument, because the noble Earl must go one step further, and show that by concurring in the prayer of the petition they would not be promoting the interests of the mass of the people, in the most efficient way of doing so. Taking the main question on the lowest ground—for he thought that, in a great country like this, the ground on which the noble Earl had argued it was the lowest—so far from thinking that the establishment of these three new episcopates would draw away one farthing from parochial purposes, it was his opinion that nothing would do so much to stimulate exertion in that direction as this moderate increase in the episcopal order. The experience of our colonies and our experience at home supported his view. The Bishop having charge of an entire diocess could bring the wants of the parishes home to the holders of property and capital in a way which the clergyman of a particular parish could not. If there had not been a Bishop of London, they would not have had the Bishop of London's Fund. The same might be said in respect of the Bishop of Winchester and other members of the Episcopal body. Where would these funds have been if there had been no Bishop to urge and superintend the collection of the money? That, however, was, as he had already observed, arguing the question on the lowest ground; but if they could show that there were large districts of the country which were not sufficiently supplied with Episcopal overlooking, they might say they wanted, by increasing the Bishops, to increase the shepherds under them, and the folds under the shepherds. The efficiency of diocesan management did not depend merely on the multiplication of clergy or of churches, important as were these elements of success. It depended more on the spirit in which the parishes were worked, in which the pulpits were filled, in which the cottages were visited; and it is the Bishop who must be the main instrument in encouraging the zealous, in stirring up the faint-hearted, in animating the despondent—he must be to his clergy the example and the mainspring of holy living and dying for the people committed to their care. He believed, therefore, that it would be good and not bad economy if they diverted, not public bounty, but some of the money derived from the Episcopal estates, and founded with it the mother centre of future parishes, instead of devoting it to the parishes themselves. But he would argue the matter upon another ground. When he beheld the constantly growing wealth of Great Britain, when he heard the increase, as he recently had done, reckoned by millions by an eminent capitalist, and when he added thereto his conviction that deep in the hearts of this mighty and wealthy people was the love of their God and their religion, he could not believe that if an appeal were rightly made the necessary funds would be wanting. If he understood his remarks aright his most rev. Brother stated that he would be satisfied if the Government would give an assurance that if private beneficence removed any difficulty with regard to the funds no opposition with respect to the erection of those sees should be encountered in other quarters. He would remind the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) in respect to the cases to which he had referred that the aspect of things had greatly changed of late years, and that if the offer were repeated he believed it would now be received in a different spirit. He could not help referring, before he sat down, to an allusion which fell from his noble Friend who presented the petition with reference to the pamphlet published in his diocess many years ago, and in a moment of haste. If he did not refer to that allusion it might possibly convey to the public a false impression, and give pain to a most excellent man. He might safely say that he had not in the whole of his diocess a layman who worked with him more heartily or more cordially than the writer of the pamphlet, nor any one who interested himself more sincerely in the lay machinery of the diocess. He must, in conclusion, express a hope that the Government would receive with sympathy and give their consideration to any proposal which might be made with reference to this subject.

THE EARL OF CHICHESTER expressed his belief that a moderate extension of the episcopate would be in every way desirable.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY also believed that a strong case had been made out for a moderate increase of the episcopate. It should be remembered that the powers of the Episcopal Bench had been much curtailed by law, and that it was chiefly by their personal influence that its members exercised authority. He thought it would even be advantageous if their legal powers were somewhat increased, because according to the present state of the law a parochial clergyman could, if he wished, act in conformity with doctrines not warranted by the Church of England, without the bishop of his diocese being able to interfere. The enormous increase which had of late years taken place in the work imposed upon bishops naturally called for an increase of their number. It was only by personal communication with his clergy and the people of his diocese generally that a bishop could make his influence fully felt; and that communication would be impossible if his jurisdiction extended over vast and densely populated districts. It was therefore desirable that the personal influence of the members of the Episcopal Bench should be increased by the area of their dioceses being curtailed. He could not but hope, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government would give their best and most favourable consideration to any proposal which might be made in this direction; believing as he did that a moderate extension of the episcopate would tend to promote the welfare of the Church.

Petition read, and ordered to lie on the table.

CHARITIES OF THE CITIES OF LONDON AND WESTMINSTER.

MOTION FOR A PAPER.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON, in moving

> "That the Digest of the Parochial Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster, referred to in the Eleventh and Twelfth Reports of the Charity Commissioners, be laid before the House,"

said, that the income of these charities throughout the kingdom was stated in these Reports to be somewhat more than £150,000 a year, their productiveness having been considerably augmented of late years. The Reports also stated that the matter was one which would deserve at no distant period the interposition of the Legislature, that the application of these funds might be regulated. The document to which the Commissioners referred entered very minutely into all the charities of the City of London; and a short analysis of it was given in the Appendix to the Report. It appeared that the parochial charities of the City of London amounted altogether to £66,000 a year, of which £26,000 was available for the repair and general purposes of the churches in the City of London. These churches now occupied a very different position from that in which they were a short time ago. The population of the City of London had greatly decreased; at the same time, the funds available for parochial purposes had very greatly increased. This was so strongly felt by the gentlemen who were interested in various parishes as to the distribution of these funds, that in one instance they had even gone the length of preparing a scheme with the intention of submitting it to the Charity Commissioners, whereby large parochial funds which they believed to be at present wasted, should be applied to middle class education. The powers of the Charity Commissioners, however, even under the Act of 1860, were extremely limited. No movement, as he understood, could be made with reference to any charity which was above £50 per annum, unless a majority of the local trustees themselves applied to the Charity Commissioners for an alteration of their trust. Even in the case of charities of small amount there was a great practical difficulty arising from the power of appeal vested in any person who might consider himself interested in the matter; and as the expenses of these appeals were generally paid out of the charity funds, it was obvious that appeals were likely to be very numerous, even when there was no very great cause for them. What, therefore, had been suggested was that, at some future time, the area throughout which these charities are dispersed, might be extended so as to include not only the City, but the actual London of the present day. Certainly the present state of things was anomalous, and the impression that there were these large funds which were not made useful, was extremely detrimental in all efforts to improve the diocese with reference to the parochial system; because it naturally occurred to every one that, before going to other public funds, or appealing very earnestly to private benevolence, they ought to see that the funds actually possessed were thoroughly well used.

Motion *agreed to.*

[*Parl. Paper*, No. 3461.]

THE BURIAL SERVICE.

QUESTION.

Lord EBURY, in rising, according to notice,

"To inquire what steps have been taken in order to remove the Grievance which exists in the present indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service, and to obtain a Revision of the Lectionary of the Established Church; also, if any measures are in contemplation to remedy certain Practices in the Performance of Divine Service of which Complaint is made,"

said, their Lordships would probably remember that two years ago he proposed a Motion for an Address for a Royal Commission in order to consider the best method of obviating evils arising from the almost indiscriminate use of the Burial Service by law established. On that occasion the gravity of the case was admitted by all who took part in the debate which ensued, and specially by the most rev. the Primate, and three or four other right rev. Prelates who spoke on the subject. He did not, however, press the Motion, because he was glad to leave the matter in the hands of the most rev. Primate, who undertook to consult the clergy and see whether he could not bring forward some measure to remedy the evil. Last year he inquired whether it was his Grace's intention to propose anything to remove the grievance? and his Grace's reply was that he had taken means of consulting the clergy, and finding that an overwhelming majority of them objected to any change whatever, he had nothing to propose. Upon this he (Lord Ebury) gave notice of his intention again to bring the Service before the House, and was about to do so when he received an intimation that the most rev. Prelate thought he saw a way of dealing with the question without altering the Service. He was sure his most rev. Friend would bear him witness that he never concurred in his opinion that this proposed mode of dealing with the subject was practicable; but, so anxious was he to leave the matter in his hands that he at once withdrew his Motion. They were now approaching the termination, not only of another Session, but of a Parliament; nothing, that he was aware of, had been done in this direction, and he was sure he would not think it impertinent if he asked his most rev. Friend the question in relation to the Burial Service of which he had given notice? He wished also to include in his question the Lectionary of the Church, the Table of Lessons, which his most rev. Friend also undertook to deal with; and after what passed in this House on Friday last with reference to the statements made by a noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Westmeath) which not only were not denied, but admitted and deplored, he wished to ask further whether his most rev. Friend was able to say if any measures were in contemplation having reference to these matters?

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY, in reply to the three Questions put by his noble Friend, would state, that last year he had intimated his entire willingness, in concurrence with his right rev. Brethren, to acquiesce in the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the question of the revision of the Lectionary; but, at the commencement of this year the Government proposed to introduce a Bill for altering the terms of subscription, and the Home Secretary, with whom these matters generally rested, intimated that one subject of this kind was enough at a time, and at his desire the subject was postponed for another year. With regard to the Question touching the Ritual, he had to answer, that neither he nor his right rev. Brethren had yet in contemplation any measure which would put an end to the practices complained of. And with regard to the Burial Service, he had before intimated his entire disinclination to any alteration in the Service itself; but, if any mode of removing what he admitted to be a grievance, without touching the Service, could be suggested, he should be glad to consider it. He honestly confessed, however, that he did not yet see any mode of doing so.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY asked the most rev. Primate, whether he would be prepared to include among the subjects of inquiry by the Royal Commission, the appointment of which he had recommended, the propriety of altering the following rubric which appeared under the "Order for Morning and Evening Prayer?"—

"And here it is to be noted that all such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of Edward the Sixth."

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that he should not like to give a definite answer to this question without consulting his right rev. Brethren.

PARTNERSHIP AMENDMENT BILL.

(NO. 162.) REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Lord WENSLEYDALE *moved* to insert the following Amendments after Clause 1:—

In order to entitle any Person, so lending Money, to the Benefit of this Act, the following Particulars shall be registered in the Manner hereinafter provided:

(1.) The Surname and Christian Name or other Name or Names in full, and the Place or Places of Residence, of the Lender and of the Partner, or, if more than One, the Partners, to whom the Money is so advanced.

(2.) The Nature of the Trade or Undertaking and of the Place or Places at which it is carried on or to be carried on.

(3.) The Name of the Firm or Style in which the said Trade or Undertaking is or is to be carried on.

(4.) The full Particulars of the Contract by which the Advance of Money by way of Loan is agreed to be made.

The Registrar of Joint Stock Companies shall be the Registrar, and shall keep a separate Register for the Registration of Trades and Undertakings under this Act.

Every Registration shall be effected within Fifteen Days after the Contract for the Advance of Money to the Person or Persons engaged or about to engage in the Trade or Undertaking shall have been entered into; and no Person lending Money shall be entitled to the Benefit of this Act in respect thereof unless the several Sums specified in the Registration shall be lent to the Person borrowing the same at the Time or at the Times respectively specified in that Behalf in such Registration, or within Fourteen Days thereof.

No Part of the Money lent under the Provisions of this Act shall be repaid, satisfied, or secured in any Manner before the Expiration of the Time registered as aforesaid in that Behalf.

Any Person so advancing Money who shall violate the Provisions of the foregoing Sections, or either of them, shall become and be a General Partner with the Person to whom it is lent.

Provided also, that such Person or Persons to whom such Advances by way of Loan shall be made shall cause in all Bills of Exchange, Promissory Notes, Cheques, Orders for Money, Bills of Parcels, Invoices, Receipts, Letters, and other Writings used in the Transaction of the Business of the Company to be added the Word, Registered, to his Name or Partnership Name.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, he concurred in the Amendments of his noble Friend. He (Lord Chelmsford), however, agreed with his noble Friend opposite (Lord Cranworth), in not being able to discover any difference in principle between a person receiving a fixed interest for a sum of money which he advanced, and being paid a fluctuating interest by taking a share of the profits. But he confessed that he had a lingering prejudice in favour of the view that a person who took a share of the profits ought to bear his share of the losses. The Bill before the House would lead to a revolution in the law of partnership, and what might be the effect of it upon the character and commercial credit of the country it was impossible to say. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack made an admirable speech the other evening, in moving the second reading of the Bill, and after listening to that speech their Lordships were quite prepared to accept the measure as it stood. But his noble and learned Friend, while he placed the advantages of the Bill in a strong light, took care to throw into the shade all the objections. He (Lord Chelmsford) ventured to submit to their Lordships that when they were about to enter into an untried system of law, such as this Bill proposed, it would not be proper for the Legislature to take such a step without taking care to provide all proper safeguards. A useful lesson might be learnt from their neighbours, the French, amongst whom there has been established for some time the partnership called *societé en commandite*, in which the general partners are liable for the whole of the society's obligations, while the *commanditaire* is liable only to the amount of the capital he has put into the concern. Thus there is combined a general and a limited partnership. In a partnership of this kind it is necessary that there should be registration, and in particular that there should be stated the amount advanced to the partnership by the *commanditaire.* The registered particulars are afterwards affixed to the walls of the Tribunal of Commerce. Certainly if the French think it necessary that there should be registration in order that the public might know the persons with whom they were dealing, *à fortiori,* in a case where a man is to be allowed to receive a large portion of the profits without being a partner the public should have warning of the terms upon which the business is carried on. Under these circumstances it was impossible for him not to agree with the Amendment of his noble and learned Friend, and he trusted that their Lordships would pause before they passed the Bill without some such safeguard as was now proposed.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he should be extremely sorry if the good work done in giving this Bill a second reading should be annulled and their progress retraced in the manner proposed by the noble and learned Lord's Amendments. The noble and learned Lord had spoken of the difficulty of divesting our minds of early impressions, and lawyers certainly were not exempt from this difficulty. The truth was that from their earliest education they imbibed the principle that the rule of law was right—they published it in their opinions, they carried it into effect in their judgments, and the feeling increased and intensified until it seemed a kind of sacrilege to question its accuracy. What this Bill proposed was not to reverse a positive principle of law, but a rule which was founded on a mistaken decision, and which, repeated from mouth to mouth with a kind of superstitious authority, had grown to be reverenced as an irreversible principle of law. What the Bill did say, and what their Lordships, by giving it a second reading, had affirmed, was this—that a trader might be at liberty to borrow, in the same manner as any other person, upon the best terms and conditions he could. If he could borrow on the condition of giving part of his profits, instead of paying a definite rate of interest, then he should be at liberty to do so. What reason or justice could there be in preventing him from doing this? The observations of his two noble and learned Friends came to this—that a great deal of mischief would ensue from this secret dealing—but what it was they did not condescend to tell their Lordships. This was the kind of terrible thing with which children were frightened. At present a trader might borrow at any rate of interest he pleased. The contract was good. The lender need not be known, although the terms might be such as would grind the trader down and prevent him deriving anything like a fair remuneration from his business. That was one instance in which there was no registration; and what evil results had flowed from it? When the usury laws were abolished they had been the idols of many generations, they had been looked on almost as matters of religion, and yet they expired with the approbation of all men. Had any evil results followed from these laws coming to an end? A man might be a secret partner now, and no registration was required. The instances referred to by the noble and learned Lord in the French law was that of anonymous partnerships, not partnerships *en commandite*, and in similar partnerships our own law required the registration of the partners. Registration was required in the case of joint stock companies; but that was an obligation attached to the privilege of a great number of individuals being associated together, none of whose names would otherwise be known to the world, and it was not done by reason of fear, but for the sake of the partnership, which would not get credit if no one knew of whom it was composed. What was proposed by his noble and learned Friend would, in fact, be utterly destructive to the trade. Noble Lords were aware how extremely sensitive credit was, and if at the same time that the trader were given the means of borrowing money on fair terms, the obligation were imposed on him of publishing to the world that he had been obliged to borrow money, how long would his credit last? The Bill might as well be put behind the fire at once if it was to have a condition of this kind annexed to it. In the House of Commons this very point was very anxiously discussed by men of the greatest mercantile experience, and upon an examination of the arguments one way and the other no one could fail to see that it had been demonstrated that the proposal was utterly at variance with the principle of the Bill, and would destroy it, and that there was no ground whatever for requiring it. He could see no reason why a restriction should be placed on the liberty of the trader to borrow which was not placed on anybody else, and he hoped their Lordships would not sanction the Amendment.

LORD ST. LEONARDS said, he had frequently heard the noble and learned Lord recommend the House to disregard the opinions held in past times, but he confessed for himself that he did feel some respect for those who had gone before him, and for the principles they had laid down. His noble and learned Friend was far above this feeling. His noble and learned Friend said, the present rule was founded on a mistake; but why were they to assume that all the learned authorities of past times had been unable to detect the mistake, and that it was left for the present age to discover for the first time the true principle of action? Were they of the present time to arrogate to themselves that sort of authority that would entitle them to disregard everything that had been established before their time? Then the noble and learned Lord told them, that if they admitted the Amendment they might as well put the Bill behind the fire; but let their Lordships consider what was the object of the Amendment. The object of the Amendment was simply to give to the public that kind of knowledge that would be sufficient to prevent men from embarking their money without knowing what security they had. His noble and learned Friend said, that what was proposed to deal with was not in effect a partnership; but he (Lord St. Leonards) must say that by the law of England, as it now stood, it was a partnership. By this Bill they proposed to allow for the first time a trader to allow another to take a share of his profits without assuming the liability of a partner. What they should guard against was that a man might trade apparently for himself, whereas in reality he was only trustee of the profits for another person. Under the proposed law a man might advance money to a trader on condition that he should receive three-fourths of the profits. The trader would then get credit from others who might think he was in a sound position, being unaware of the private arrangement with the lender of the capital. He could assure their Lordships that there was a great feeling of apprehension in the country in reference to this Bill, but there had not been full time for the expression of that opinion. He had himself presented two petitions to their Lordships, from the Chamber of Commerce of Dundee and the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants of Edinburgh, and both petitions contained exactly the same complaints of the absence of publicity in such transactions as were about to be authorized. He had also received a letter from a gentleman who had been in a large way of business, and who had establishments both in London and Lyons. The gentleman took a warm interest in this Bill. He wrote—

> "To my mind there is something frightful in contemplating the fraud, litigation, and uncertainty that must ensue from the Bill if it is passed in its present shape. An English partnership will be as uncertain and equivocal as a Scotch marriage, and commercial credit will be much endangered."

He added—

> "Only ten days ago I showed the proposed Bill to the Judge of the Tribunal of Commerce in Lyons, and he shook his head and held up his hands in amazement."

He (Lord St. Leonards) spoke in the interest of the trader, when he advocated a certain amount of publicity in these transactions. The usury laws, which had been referred to, were not analogous to the present case; they affected all classes, and not the trading class only. Several recent Acts of Parliament had established the principle which he sought to introduce into this Bill—that of registering liabilities, so that all the world might know the solvency or insolvency of the man with whom they were dealing. If a man, for instance, gave a warrant of attorney to confess judgment his creditor must publish that document by registering it. The wholesale traders were beginning to feel that if this Bill passed they would not know whom to trust, or whether a man was carrying on a business for his own interest or in the interest of other parties. A more important measure, as regarded trade and commerce, than that before their Lordships had never been introduced into Parliament, and time would tell whether the warning uttered from his side of the House was well or ill founded.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 14; Not-contents 39: Majority 25.

Amendment *negatived*.

CONTENTS.

Derby, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Verulam, E.

Hawarden, V.

Chelmsford, L. [*Teller.*]
Churston, L.

Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Denman, L.
Kingsdown, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saint Leonards, L.
Wensleydale, L. [*Teller.*]
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Grafton, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Saint Germans, E.

Suffolk and Berkshire, E.

Eversley, V.
Falmouth, V.
Torrington, V.

Abinger, L.
Belper, L.
Camoys, L.
Chesham, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne.*)
De Mauley, L.
De Tabley, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]

Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)	Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Hastings, L.	Stanley of Alderley, L.
Leigh, L.	Talbot de Malahide, L.
Mostyn, L.	Wenlock, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]	Wentworth, L.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, he had an Amendment to propose which had become infinitely more important and necessary for the protection of the public, in consequence of the rejection of those safeguards which his noble and learned Friend had brought forward for the registration of the particular contract into which a party entered for the loan of money. A person advancing money to carry on a business would always have access to the books. If the concern flourished, he would be content with the profits he had stipulated to receive; but if he saw there was danger, and the trade was likely to prove a failing one, he would immediately withdraw his capital, render himself safe, and leave to the other creditors a man of no substance for the satisfaction of their debts. He therefore proposed that if within twelve months after the lender had withdrawn his money, bankruptcy, or insolvency, or a composition with creditors should take place, or the person conducting the business should die insolvent, the money withdrawn should be liable to the debts of the concern, or so much thereof as the assets of the partnership should be insufficient to satisfy.

An Amendment *moved,* in Page 1, Line 14, after ("such") insert the following clause:—

"If the Lender of such Loan shall withdraw the same or any Part thereof from the Trade or Undertaking, and within a Year afterwards the Trader shall be adjudged bankrupt, or shall take the Benefit of any Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors, or shall enter into any Agreement to pay his Creditors less than Twenty Shillings in the Pound, or shall die in insolvent Circumstances, the Sum so withdrawn shall be applicable to the Payment of the Debts and Liabilities incurred in carrying on such Trade or Undertaking."—(*Lord Chelmsford.*)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY opposed the Amendment as unnecessary. The principle of the Bill having been already affirmed, it was not, in his opinion, competent to the noble and learned Lord to treat as a partner a person who lent money out of his share in the profits. Sufficient security would be given to the public by the clause which provided that the claims of the lender should, in case of bankruptcy, be postponed until all other creditors had been satisfied.

LORD CHELMSFORD said, that in the case which he had suggested the lender would have withdrawn his money, and therefore would not be a creditor or have any claim to be postponed.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR thought that the existing law as to fraudulent preferences would be sufficient to attain the object which the noble and learned Lord had in view. He objected to the provision that money withdrawn within twelve months of bankruptcy should be recovered by the creditors, that it was possible that none of those who were creditors at the time of the bankruptcy might have been creditors when the money was withdrawn.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause 5 (In case of Bankruptcy, &c., Lender not to rank with other Creditors).

On Motion of Lord CHELMSFORD, the words "or such Widow or Child" *struck out.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill to be read 3^a on *Monday* next.

ROCHDALE VICARAGE BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to regulate the Appointment of a Vicar or Incumbent to the Vicarage of the Parish Church of Rochdale in the County of Lancaster and in the Diocese of Manchester—Was *presented* by The Earl of CHICHESTER; read 1^a; and to be *printed.* (No. 213.)

NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Naval Discipline Act, 1864—Was *presented* by The Duke of SOMERSET; read 1^a; to be *printed.* (No. 214.)

House adjourned at Nine o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 23, 1865.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Thomas Brassey, esquire, the younger, *for* Devonport.

SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Shannon River (No. 400)*; Tenure and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) (No. 402)*; Education (No. 403).*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Marriages (Lambourne)* [*Lords*] [237]; Railways Debentures, &c. Registry* [*Lords*] [241]; Admiralty, &c. Acts Repeal* [*Lords*] [242]; Admiralty Powers, &c.* [*Lords*] [243]; Dockyard Ports Regulation* [*Lords*] [244].

Committee — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. (*re-comm.*) [218]; Indemnity* [234]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [235]; Compound Spirits Warehousing* [233]; Inland Revenue* [207].

Report—Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* [209]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [225]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. (*re-comm.*) [218]; Indemnity* [234]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [235]; Compound Spirits Warehousing* [233]; Inland Revenue* [207].

Considered as amended—Fire Brigade (Metropolis) [230]; Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [133]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* [209].

Third Reading—Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* [209]; War Department Tram (Devon)* [*Lords*] [204]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [225]; Fire Brigade (Metropolis)* [230].

CONSOLIDATED FUND APPROPRIATION BILL.—*COMMITTEE.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH said, that the Bill was a great improvement on former Appropriation Bills, which, generally speaking, had not been printed, and were drawn up in a manner difficult to be understood. He trusted that the improvement would be extended to the public accounts. At present there were no means of making a satisfactory comparison between one year and another. As far as he could make out, it seemed that there was a permanent increase to the amount of £141,000 in the Consolidated Fund. The sums paid for superannuations were actually one-fourteenth of the whole Revenue of the year. No less than £5,000,000 a year were spent in superannuation and retiring allowances in the various Departments of the public service. A paper had been put into the hands of Members that morning, in which the Government took credit for a reduction of £155,895 in the Civil Service Estimates. That reduction appeared to him to be deceptive.

Mr. PEEL said, that the Appropriation Bill, in its present amended form, stated the amount of the various grants in figures instead of, as formerly, in words; it avoided useless repetitions of the same words, it removed from the body of the Act to the Schedule the various items; it arranged into classes the several Votes, and enabled any one readily to find the particular grant he wished to trace. The hon. Member was not justified in speaking of the paper in question as deceptive. It was a comparison between the present and last year. The reduction arose chiefly from their being no Vote this year for the redemption of the Scheldt Dues. Considering how many new Votes there were in the present year—the Votes, for example, for the Fire Brigade, for the Registry of Deeds Office, for Flax Cultivation in Ireland, for Agricultural Statistics in England, and for Harwich Harbour—it was satisfactory that the amount required was less than that voted last year.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

FIRE BRIGADE (METROPOLIS) BILL.

[BILL 230.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause 18 (Contributions by Government towards Expense of Brigade).

Mr. BLACKBURN said, it was intended to maintain this Fire Brigade by a local rate, at not exceeding a halfpenny in the pound, but instead of extending the rate to Government property, in which there would doubtless be difficulty, the sum of £10,000 per annum was to be paid on account of the national property in the metropolis. That was assuming it to be of the annual value of £4,800,000, or one-fourth of the whole rateable property of the metropolis. He could not admit the accuracy of this calculation, and in order that the same law should apply to national as to private property, he should move an Amendment to that effect.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 18, page 6, line 26, to leave out the words "the sum of ten thousand pounds," in order to insert the words "a sum equal to the amount that would be leviable by a rate of one-halfpenny in the pound on the full and fair annual value of all such property within the Metropolis belonging to the Crown, or to any Department of Government, as would be rated to the relief of the poor were the said property rateable for that purpose,"—(*Mr. Blackburn,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. T. G. BARING said, it was almost impossible to estimate the beneficial occupation of the Government property in the metropolis. It was only necessary to mention Buckingham Palace, for example. Again, from Woolwich to Pimlico there was Government property of enormous value, the loss of which would affect, not only the convenience, but in some cases the safety of the country. Two Committees of that House had been of opinion that a contribution of £10,000 would not be two much for the Government to pay towards the new Fire Brigade. He hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press an Amendment which would overturn the whole arrangement on which the Bill was founded.

Lord FERMOY said, the inhabitants of the metropolis had come very badly out of the negotiation as it stood; and the Amendment would make matters still worse.

Question, "That the words 'the sum of ten thousand pounds' stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Another Amendment made.

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

POOR LAW BOARD CONTINUANCE, &c., (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 218.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Lord FERMOY said, that this Bill was, on the face of it, a deception. It was described as a Poor Law Continuance Bill, yet of all the twenty-four clauses only one, the first, enacted the continuance of the Poor Law Board. The other clauses excited much difference of opinion both in and out of that House. The 24th clause declared that the Bill might be "cited and described for all purposes as 'the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1865,'" and that was exactly what the Bill was. It was impossible for his right hon. Friend to carry the Bill in its present shape, and he would suggest that the Bill should be limited to a single clause, continuing the Poor Law Board for one year. The question involved in the religious clauses alone would keep them there for a fortnight or three weeks, and it was too important a question to be hurried through the House. He would move, as an Amendment to the Motion—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the provisions of the Bill should be limited to the continuance of the powers of the Poor Law Board for one year."

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS seconded the Motion. He said some of the largest parishes in the metropolis had petitioned against the Bill, and the House had, he thought, some reason to complain of the indecent haste with which the President of the Poor Law Board attempted to force the Bill through at the fag-end of the Session. Why had it not been brought forward sooner, when it would have been a charity to find the House something to do?

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the provisions of this Bill should be limited to the continuance of the Poor Law Board for one year,"—(*Lord Fermoy,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SPEAKER said, that if the Amendment were carried it would negative the Motion to go into Committee, and that therefore it would be impossible to pass even that part of the Bill which would continue the Poor Law Board.

Viscount GALWAY said, he objected to the Bill, and he trusted that the President of the Poor Law Board would not refuse to accede to what was evidently the general feeling of the House. He would not object to the Speaker leaving the Chair, in order that the first clause might be carried. But the other clauses of the Bill were of great importance, and would lead to a great deal of discussion. The Bill proposed to deal with the Gilbert Unions. A few years ago the House would not agree to a dissolution of these unions, and it was rather hard that they should be put under the power of the Poor Law Board without having a word to say on their own behalf.

Sir BROOK BRYDGES said, it was too late in the Session to discuss the important clauses of this Bill. There were important taxing powers in the Bill given to the Poor Law Board independently of the Guardians. These might be very proper, or they might be very improper, powers for the Poor Law Commissioners to possess; but the alterations in the law were most important. The Bill was brought forward when hon. Members could not discuss its provisions with satisfaction to their constituents, and he believed that the majority of the House were anxious that the Bill should be cut down to a mere continuance Bill.

SIR JOHN SHELLEY said, it was his duty, having presented a great number of petitions against the Bill, to represent to his right hon. Friend (Mr. Villiers) that in the interest of the Poor Law Board itself it would be extremely imprudent to press the clauses of the Bill, with the exception of the continuance clause. The other matters should be discussed in the New Parliament.

MR. WHITE said, he concurred in urging on the President of the Poor Law Board to adopt this plan. He had presented a petition from the directors and board of guardians of Brighton praying the House not to enter upon a discussion of clauses from 9 to 18. The matters to which those clauses related could not receive adequate attention in the present Parliament, and he hoped that they would simply pass a continuance Bill.

SIR MATTHEW RIDLEY said, he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman not to go on with the Bill.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, that the noble Lord (Lord Fermoy) stated, not very courteously, that this Bill was one of deception, because, professing to be one of continuance, it contained many other clauses. That statement was wholly unfounded. The title of the Bill was "A Bill to continue the Poor Law Board for a limited period, and to make certain Amendments in the law regulating the Relief of the Poor." The noble Lord was a Member of the Committee, which sat for three years, and he could not affirm that the introduction of the Bill was in any sense a surprise. The Report of the Committee was sent to every Board of Guardians in the country; and the guardians had considered the Report and taken action on it, and had presented petitions to the House, and memorials to the Poor Law Board. They had singled out those portions of it to which they objected, namely, the payment of priests out of the rates, and any interference with the discretion of the guardians in the education of the children. Those objections had been respected; but no one had objected to those parts of the Report which were embodied in the Bill. The real objection to the Bill was to prevent the Roman Catholic clergy from having access to the workhouses, and giving instruction to their own people. The Roman Catholics some time since having complained that an Act of Parliament having given access to the workhouses for their priests, they were still not admitted, the Duke of Richmond, with the consent of Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, issued an order to meet the case, but at this order the guardians took offence, saying that the order gave a direction to the guardians to procure Roman Catholic priests to attend to the unions. The Resolution of the Committee, embodied in the present Bill, fell something short of that order of the Duke of Richmond. He would ask hon. Gentlemen who complained of the lateness of the Session to name the day before which he could have introduced this Bill. It was brought in at the first opportunity. The clauses relating to the register of creed, to access to the inmates by the Ministers for religious instruction, and to going to a place of worship were approved by the Secretary of the Protestant Alliance, and he thought himself safe when he obtained the approval of that Gentleman. The fact was, that considerable pains had been taken to bring hon. Members there that day to vote against this Bill; yet, considering the exertions that had been made, the result was not very striking. Those most likely to object to the religious clauses were absent. His hon. Friend (Sir John Shelley) told the House that he had presented a great number of petitions against the Bill, but if so they had not been reported in the Votes. He did not believe that twenty petitions had been presented against the measure, although there were 700 unions in the country. He had received deputations from Boards of Guardians, and he believed that, after explanation, they had been in most cases satisfied with the religious clauses. There were 250,000 Roman Catholics in the metropolis who were just as loyal as any other class, and a great injustice was inflicted upon that body by the present system. In the pauper schools and workhouses of the metropolis no notice was in many cases taken of their religious opinions, and it was notorious that their children were sent to schools where they were brought up as Protestants. One of the Poor Law inspectors went to a district school containing 700 children, and asked whether they had any Roman Catholic or Dissenting children among them. They said they had none. He had great reason to believe that many of these were the children of Roman Catholic parents, and he went to the workhouse to make inquiry. He saw a poor woman, a Roman Catholic, left with four children, who had been sent to this school. The inspector asked her of what religion her children were. She replied, "They are Catholics, or ought to be." She knew, nevertheless, they were being brought up as Protestants, and, being asked why she had not complained, she said, "What is a poor woman like me to do?" The inspector knew of 350 children of whose religion no notice was taken, and he knew that the parents and relatives of some of them were Roman Catholics, although the children were brought up as Protestants. At Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham correct registers were kept, the religious feelings of the poor were consulted, and no ill-will was excited between Roman Catholics and Protestants. He knew a metropolitan district inhabited by a million of souls, and containing ten workhouses, in which not the least notice was taken of the religion of the children. Now, these poor people did care whether their children were brought up as Roman Catholics or Protestants. Some thought, indeed, that the poor cared more for their children in this respect than the rich, but at any rate they had feelings which were entitled to respect. The Roman Catholics had good ground of complaint in this matter, and if hon. Members refused to do them justice now they would hear more of this hereafter.

Mr. HENLEY said, he had hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would not have resumed his seat without expressing his willingness to concede to the evident wish of the House. The right hon. Gentleman intimated that the objection to the measure was entirely owing to the religious clauses, but he had not stated the reasons on which he founded that opinion. Upon his (Mr. Henley's) side he had heard no objections founded upon the merits or demerits of a single clause. The religious clauses were only a small part of the Bill, but if they were so important, why had not the right hon. Gentleman brought in the Bill two or three months ago? What was to hinder him? Hon. Members would then have had an opportunity of hearing the opinion of their constituents. He did not wish to give his opinion upon any of the clauses of the Bill, but it contained five main provisions. With regard to the first of these the Gilbert Unions had a right to be heard. The next provision was the taxing power, which was now restrained by the consent of the Board of Guardians. By the 8th clause, however, the right hon. Gentleman took power to order an expenditure of £500,000 without any consent at all, and he might repeat that as often as he pleased. The next was a power to transport children from one part of the country to another without reference to distance. Then came the religious clauses of the Bill. It was somewhat singular that the right hon. Gentleman, having had this subject before him for six years, and the Committee having been sitting for three years, and the right hon. Gentleman having communicated with Boards of Guardians, should have brought in a set of clauses, and then, before the ink with which they were printed was dry, should have withdrawn and amended his own clauses. If the right hon. Gentleman, after all this time for consideration, and after having had his official experience directed to the matter, thought it necessary to amend his own proposition, it was odd that the House of Commons were to be allowed no time for consideration, and were to have many unpleasant things thrown at them because they would not, without discussion, accede to these proposals. There was one very curious thing in the Bill as amended. The right hon. Gentleman had divested himself of the power of censorship over religious books, but he retained in his own hands the very extraordinary power of deciding whether a child of twelve years old was to be permitted to choose his religion. Whether the right hon. Gentleman intended to make a journey into the country, in order personally to examine these children, or whether he intended to have them sent up to him by third class trains to be examined at the Poor Law Board, or how this clause was to be otherwise worked out, he did not know. Another strong power was taken by this Bill. If a man or a woman, being out of the workhouse, applied for relief for a sick child and got it, and if the Board of Guardians saw fit to order them to do task work, and the parent neglected or refused to do it, he or she was to be considered an idle and disorderly person, and might be sent to prison as a vagrant. Another provision gave the Board of Guardians a taxing power with reference to the superannuation of a number of persons who had nothing to do with the relief of the poor. The House ought surely to know the opinions of the Guardians and the taxpayers before they adopted such a clause. All these were important alterations in the law, which might or might not be advisable, but which it was impossible to discuss after the Appropriation Bill had passed through Committee. There was no earthly reason that he could see why the Bill should not have been laid on the table three months ago. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would, in deference to the universal opinion on all sides of the House, agree to make this simply a Continuance Bill, and not drive hon. Members to move that the Chairman report progress after every clause. At this period of the Session it was utterly impossible that the questions of pauper emigration and officers' superannuation could be fairly discussed. In six months all the other matters contained in the Bill could be discussed and adopted. His own opinion was in favour of what were called the religious clauses of the Bill; but, in the interest of those for whom they were framed, it would be better they should be passed after the Bill had been sufficiently considered by the country, rather than leave it to be said that it had been snatched through after the Appropriation Bill had been brought in, and thus drive many persons to be awkward in the working of the Bill. Another reason for more consideration was, that the wording of some of the clauses was very defective. The clause enabling ministers to visit and instruct the inmates of his persuasion was so indefinitely drawn that he did not believe a single Minister would be able to avail himself of the provision.

MR. LOCKE said, that the objections were not confined to the religious clauses. That morning he received a communication from the Bermondsey Board of Guardians, who objected to clauses from 16 to 19 inclusive, not one of which referred to religion.

MR. KNIGHT said, he must for himself indignantly repudiate the assertion of the President of the Poor Law Board that this Bill was opposed on anti-Roman Catholic grounds. All that the Roman Catholics could justly demand would have been given them by the order which the Duke of Richmond, with the consent of Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, had proposed to issue; and now the right hon. Gentleman, having been in office for six years and done nothing, proposed to hurry a Bill through Parliament at the eve of a general election, to do what would have been done by the Duke of Richmond's order. The right hon. Gentleman had, after all, left out the best part of the Select Committee's recommendations—namely, that Roman Catholic children should be handed over to Roman Catholic schools and maintained therein by the guardians. To say that hon. Members on his (the Opposition) side of the House refused to give Roman Catholic children their religious rights and privileges was, in fact, a mere bit of electioneering tactics.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD said, he was delighted to hear from the hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) with his large experience, that he looked with favour on the religious clauses of this Bill. It was a sanction of an important principle for which the Roman Catholics would be very grateful. It had been said that the Session was so advanced that the measure could not be properly discussed. He did not concur in that opinion. At all events he was willing to accept what he desired whenever it was offered to him; and he trusted that his right hon. Friend would go on and try and pass the Bill. It contained clauses of great importance, affecting deeply the religious liberties of large numbers of the most destitute persons in the country, and which clause had undergone the careful consideration of a Select Committee of that House. Why delay for another year the consideration of these important matters? Next year there would be a new Parliament, with new Members and with new subjects for consideration. The management of workhouses varied in different places. Roman Catholics had great complaints of that management in many places, especially in the metropolis. Bricklayers and dock labourers flocked to London. Without them the metropolis would be wanted in its magnitude and in its present commerce. But having done their work they died, and their families were often forced into the workhouses, where, for want of instruction, they were led away from the religion of their forefathers. He regretted that so many hon. Members connected with the metropolis had spoken in favour of delay, because it was in the metropolitan workhouses that the children of Roman Catholic parents were most frequently perverted from the faith in which they had been brought up. This Bill would meet the evil, and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would proceed with it. Thank God! there had been throughout the debate such an enunciation of liberal feeling towards the Roman Catholics in workhouses on both sides as to lead to the conviction that, at all events, if not this year, yet still eventually and ere long, the case would be treated equitably, and the existing evil be met by a proper remedy.

SIR JOHN TROLLOPE said, he must remind the House that this debate might have been greatly shortened if the President of the Board had not thrown out the taunts he had. For himself he would say that all the right hon. Gentleman's taunts were entirely without foundation. The right hon. Gentleman intimated that hon. Members on the Opposition Benches had been summoned there in large numbers to defeat the Bill. He for one had received no such summons. It was still more unfounded to assert that his hon. Friends met this Bill in a spirit of bigotry. He agreed that Roman Catholic children should be fully open to religious teaching in the tenets in which they had been brought up, and that if this teaching could not be obtained in the workhouse, it should be procured out of it. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell the House whether he meant to go into the Bill as it stood, or limit it to a continuance Bill? If the former, he would find hon. Members on the opposite side of the House willing to consider the clauses, and that not in a spirit of bigotry.

MR. NEATE said, he was prepared to give his humble support to the Bill as it stood. Especially he approved of Clause 22, which extended the limits to which children would be sent for the purpose of education.

SIR MINTO FARQUHAR said, he could not help thinking that the President of the Poor Law Board was rather too apt to assume an aggressive attitude towards the Opposition Benches. But why had not the right hon. Gentleman turned round on his "Liberal friends," as they called themselves, and attacked them for their opposition to his Bill? Instead of which the right hon. Gentleman must needs attack those who sat on the opposite side of the House, and told them they had been whipped up to oppose this Bill from religious feelings. He could tell the right hon. Gentleman such was not the case, and that hon. Members on that side were too independent to be whipped up for any such purposes. The right hon. Gentleman had entirely misinterpreted the feelings of those who sat upon the Opposition Benches. Their only reason for opposing the Bill was, that its clauses required full consideration, which the present Session would not afford time to give.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he did not think the House would have been satisfied if his right hon. Friend. after so long an inquiry by the Select Committee on Poor Laws, had proposed a mere continuance of the powers of the Poor Law Board for a year without embodying in such a measure some of the most important recommendations of the Committee. His right hon. Friend had withdrawn some of the clauses to which considerable objection had been made as requiring further consideration, and had hoped that those now left in the Bill might have been thought reasonable enough to pass without any considerable delay or discussion. It was clear, however, that there was on the part of the House a great indisposition to go on with the clauses during the short remaining period of the Session. It was impossible at the present hour (3 o'clock) to make any progress with the clauses in Committee. One great advantage had been gained by the discussion. They had heard from every Gentleman who had addressed the House a concurrence in those clauses the object of which was to give the Roman Catholic children in workhouses these religious rights and privileges to which they were justly entitled. Seeing the evident indisposition of the House to go into the consideration of the clauses this Session, and being of opinion that the measure could not be passed during the short remaining period of the Session, he would advise his right hon. Friend, having done his duty in bringing in this measure, and having made the best fight he could, to consent to limit the Bill this Session to a mere Continuance Bill. If his noble Friend would withdraw his Amendment, the House might go into Committee and pass the Continuance Clause, and the other clauses could then be withdrawn. The Government would, if they were in office, propose a measure containing those clauses as soon as possible after Parliament should meet, and he trusted that the expression of opinion which they had that day heard would insure the favourable consideration and adoption of them in the next Session of Parliament.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, it was evident that there was a sort of tacit agreement between the Roman Catholics and the Poor Law Board to supersede the guardians in the management of unions: and there was a rivalry between the two sides of the House in making concessions to the Roman

Catholics and their priesthood. He did not, however, think that the feeling prevailed in the country as it did in that House. The impression was that on the one hand the Roman Catholics were pressing their demands, and on the other the Poor Law Board was pressing its authority, and that the Board of Guardians was to be superseded with the concurrence of the two parties. That feeling was justified by the circumstances, by the day's debate, by the character of the Bill, and by the attempt made to pass it when it was well known that many Members of this House were already addressing their constituents, that, in fact, the House was a mere shadow of itself, and that the legislative power was almost entirely transferred to the Government. The House of Commons was much more careless on this subject than the country generally. England was not ashamed of its National Protestantism; and though in that House hon. Members treated all religions alike, the people had a National Religion, and were becoming aware that the Roman Catholics were beginning to make themselves as oppressive as they were in other parts of the world. He trusted that at the coming election the people would instruct their representatives as to the course to be taken on this important matter.

Mr. HENLEY said, he wished to make one observation, and that was that should he be a Member of the next Parliament he would be ready to give his support in carrying the clauses now omitted from the present Bill.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Continuance of the Poor Law Board for One Year).

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, he adhered to the opinion he had expressed that the Bill had been opposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite solely on the ground of the religious clauses. He had, however, no help for it except, very unwillingly, to submit to the proposal that had been made. With regard to the clause which rendered persons liable to be punished who were relieved out of the workhouse and who refused to perform task-work, he must remind the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) that the clause merely gave the same power in regard to persons out of the workhouse that was exercised over those in the house.

Sir JOHN TROLLOPE said, it was exceedingly inconvenient to come to Parliament from time to time to continue the Board. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman extend the term from one to three years?

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, he thought he was meeting the wish of hon. Gentlemen opposite by limiting the continuance of the Board to one year, and "to the end of the then next Session of Parliament." That was really a continuance for two years.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses put, and *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered on *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 238.]

TENURE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND).—*COMMITTEE.*

Report *brought up.*

The Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into an Act on the tenure of land in Ireland was brought up and received.

Mr. HENNESSY asked that the Report should be read by the Clerk, as it contained some important recommendations.

Report read; to lie upon the table, and to be *printed.* [No. 402.]

INDIA—LUCKNOW PRIZE MONEY.

QUESTION.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, When the second payment of the Lucknow Prize Money, already ordered to be distributed in India, is to be made in this country; and when a decision is likely to be come to with reference to the Kirwee Prize Money?

Sir CHARLES WOOD, in reply, said, the first question of the hon. Gentleman was exactly the same as that asked on the 28th of March. He had no information then to give as to when the payment would take place. He was surprised himself at the delay, and on the 31st of March he wrote to India on the subject, but he had not yet received any reply, and it was therefore out of his power to say when the distribution would be made. He wished he could persuade hon. Gentlemen that he had nothing to do with the duty of distribution; that rested with the Treasury.

When the Court would decide on the question of the Kirwee Prize Money it was out of his power to say.

ARMY—DRESS OF MILITARY CHAPLAINS.—QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether a Circular or Memorandum or other document has lately been issued by the War Department or the Horse Guards, forbidding any of Her Majesty's Military Chaplains from officiating or preaching in the usual black gown, and requiring them to wear the surplice exclusively on all such occasions from the date of such Order; and, if so, what is the Ecclesiastical Authority who is responsible for having recommended the adoption of that course?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, in reply to the hon. Gentleman, he would read an extract from the circular referred to. The direction given was the following:—

> "The robe issued by Government for your use is the surplice. It is the only robe which you will be expected to carry with you in the event of your serving in the field. You are, therefore, to wear it with a scarf or stole, and the hood of your academical degree, if you be a graduate of one of our Universities, as often as you officiate to troops, whether in a consecrated or unconsecrated church, a chapel-school, a lecture or other ordinary room, or in the open air."

That circular was sent out on the recommendation of the Chaplain General, and it was rendered necessary by certain irregularities of some individuals in conducting the service, owing to extreme views held by them. He had not had an opportunity of seeing the Chaplain General, but he did not believe that there was any direction prohibiting the use of the black gown on the ordinary occasions, or that the surplice should be used exclusively.

INDIAN FINANCES.—QUESTION.

MR. VANSITTART said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the table of the House a copy of Sir Charles Trevelyan's Financial Statement previous to making his own on Monday next?

SIR CHARLES WOOD, in reply, said, he had had hopes of being able to make the statement upon Indian finances on Monday; but he was quite unable to do so, and he must therefore postpone it till Thursday. With regard to Sir Charles Trevelyan's statement, he thought it would not be

proper to lay that document on the table of the House. It was not an official document, and if the hon. Gentleman would refer to some papers moved for by the hon. Member for London he would find a Minute which contained Sir Charles Trevelyan's views on the subject of the income tax.

NAVY—ASSISTANT SURGEONS.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, on behalf of the hon. and gallant Member for Queen's County (Colonel Dunne), he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty the reason why Surgeons in the Royal Navy have been recently appointed to ships to do Assistant Surgeons' duty, and if it be owing to a scarcity of the latter Officers, or that there are no Candidates on the list for admission into the Medical Service of the Navy; and if the Admiralty have taken any steps to remove so great an evil?

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, that several young surgeons had been placed on promotion on foreign stations in order to retain their services on board ship as surgeons, partly for the purpose of keeping young surgeons employed, and partly because there was more or less difficulty in filling up the places of assistant surgeons. There was so much employment elsewhere, that they did not keep the number complete. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the Admiralty were in great want of assistant surgeons, but that was not the case; and the Admiralty did not think it necessary to take any steps for the purpose of giving additional facilities for the entry of assistant surgeons into the service.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Moved, That the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday next.

CHAIN CABLES AND ANCHORS.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. LAIRD said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the Report of Mr. Galloway and Mr. Grey to the Board of Trade on the Chain Cables and Anchors Act of 1864, which was laid upon the table of the House 8th of March last. He himself had introduced a Bill in 1863 for testing chain cables and anchors . He had originally taken up the question because his own experience had led him to the conclusion that it was expedient that all the anchors purchased from private firms should be tested by means of a public testing machine. That the testing machines throughout the country generally were inefficient, was clearly proved by the report of the officers whose names he had mentioned, and the only security, as far as he could judge from the inquiries which he had made, against the continuance of a similar state of things was that the cables and anchors used by our ships should be tested by a public machine. Indeed, he believed he might state that the committee at Lloyd's, and others interested in the matter, had remonstrated in every way they could with the Board of Trade against licensing the machines of private individuals. Brown, Lennox, and Co., to whom such a licence had been granted, were, no doubt, a most respectable firm, but then if a licence were given to them there was no reason why it should not be granted to every respectable firm throughout the country, and it was, he was informed, the practice of the Government to have the cables supplied to them, although they might be tested previously by the maker, retested by a special officer of their own before they were used. The Act was not imperative, but left an option to the Board of Trade to appoint testers and to refuse licences to private firms. Mr. Galloway and Mr. Grey were appointed by the Board of Trade to go round to the various manufactories, and they made a report on the subject last year, from which he would read some passages. They stated—

> "As regards the Act itself we find that it is, with one or two exceptions, looked on and received as a boon. It was represented to us that it will be the means of raising the cable trade from what is described as the present lamentable condition, and that it will be of immense value to the honest maker in the foreign trade. We have been shown specimens of bad iron, almost resembling plateglass in brittleness, that has been used in making chains to meet the market, and we have been shown good iron that may be used, and if used that will make a chain guaranteed to stand 15 per cent beyond the Admiralty proof. We were told repeatedly that the honest maker now sees his way to making a really good chain at a profit, without fear of being undersold by a bad article made by a small maker. The great majority of chain-makers also object strongly to any maker beiug allowed to test his own cable for the purpose of giving a certificate of public proof. And many makers who intend to go to the expense of making their machines perfect have expressed their determination not to take out a licence, but to have all their work tested at a public machine. Many chain cable makers expressed a hope that the committee of *Lloyd's Register* will refuse to class a ship unless her cable and anchors are proved at a machine other than the one belonging to the establishment at which they are made. They stated that such a rule had been made, but they feared it had been departed from in favour of one or two makers. We stated that this appeared to us to be a point with which the Board of Trade cannot properly interfere, but we were nevertheless particularly requested to mention the subject in our report."

He (Mr. Laird) was sorry to hear that the Board of Trade had licensed Messrs. Brown, Lennox, and Co. If a licence was granted to them it must be granted to other parties, and instead of the Act being a great security, it might be worked in such a way as to be very injurious. If the operation of the Bill was not postponed for three or six months, its tendency would be to throw a monopoly into the hands of a few makers. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to the principle of the Act, and not go on licensing private individuals. As it was there was not sufficient public machinery to do the work of testing, and if the operation of the Act were not postponed for a few months, the result would be that a monopoly would be given to those firms which were in the neighbourhood of public machines. Under these circumstances he hoped the President of the Board would take care that the principle of the Act, which involved the application of a public test, would be adhered to.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he thought that as the Act was to come into operation on the 1st of July it would be advisable to wait to see how it worked before introducing into it any Amendments. The Board of Trade were doing all that lay in their power to abide by the provisions of the law, and did not license chainmakers, but the testing machine itself, which it was authorised to do. It was the duty of the Board to satisfy themselves by inspection that the machinery used for testing chain cables was efficient in order that the cables tested by the machine might receive the proof stamp. They had certainly licensed the firm of Brown, Lennox, and Co., who had a testing machine which was their own property, and if they had not done so there would be no testing machine in London, although the Act would so soon come into force. Their machine had been found to be most effective, and Messrs. Lloyd had engaged to make such alterations as was requisite to provide an effective machinery also. His hon. Friend, he might add, was mistaken if he supposed that he could attain the object which he seemed to have in view, by laying it down as a rule that no testing machine should be licensed which was the property of a chainmaker. The fact was, that chainmakers were members of joint-stock associations, and might do in that capacity precisely the same thing as the hon. Gentleman was opposed to their doing as individuals. In proof of the accuracy of what he had stated, he might refer to Lloyd's, who were of opinion that testing machines should be under the control and superintendence of some responsible public body, and they would only pass such chains as were tested by such bodies; and amongst these bodies were Messrs. Lloyd, of Poplar; the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board Testing Company, Lloyd's Public Chain and Anchor Proving House, and the Sunderland Public Chain and Anchor Testing House. These machines were all the property of chainmakers, who possessed most admirable machinery. If a man bought a chain from Messrs. Brown and Co. he might say, "I don't approve of testing it by your machine," and he might take it to Lloyd's. In fact, the purchaser had his security in his own hands. The question was whether they had not gone far enough in licensing testing machines. It would be only throwing dust in the eyes of the public if he were to pretend that by laying down some general rule as to the persons to whom licence should be given perfect testing machines could be secured. That could be done only by means of some independent corporation or the Government taking the testing machines under their own charge. But corporations would not, perhaps, be willing to set up those machines. The trade should be allowed, therefore, to go on, and licences should be given to such machines as were found to be good and sufficient, and the purchaser left to go elsewhere if he pleased. An application had been made to the Board of Trade to postpone the operation of this Act, and he, thinking that the application had emanated from the great body of persons interested in the question, was favourably disposed to postponement. But he found, upon inquiry, that the great body of the trade in Staffordshire and other places did not desire any postponement whatever. The Board of Trade, therefore, had come to the conclusion to license before the 1st of July a sufficient number of testing machines. There would be one in London, two in Birkenhead, three in Staffordshire, one in Sunderland, and others in other places. He was informed by persons competent to speak upon the subject, that there was no necessity whatever for any postponement of the operation of the Act. The Board of Trade notices were published in December last, every one was prepared for the Act coming into operation on the 1st of July; if any one had neglected to provide proper testing machines the fault was his own, nor would it be fair to those who had taken the trouble and gone to the expense of providing machines, to postpone the operation of the Act, in order to suit the views of some manufacturers who had not acted with equal promptitude. A letter had been addressed to him, signed by the great majority of the principal chainmakers in Staffordshire, in which he was informed that there was not the slightest necessity for deferring the operation of the Act, inasmuch as the testing machines there and in Liverpool were very short of work, and were quite equal to the duties required of them. They further stated they had refused to concur in the application lately drawn up and presented to the Board of Trade, by one manufacturer who sought a postponement for his own private convenience, and not with a view to the public benefit. They had expended upwards of £10,000 on the machines, and they would suffer considerable loss if the operation of the Act were postponed. Under these circumstances, having consulted the Board of Trade Inspectors, and being assured that no general inconvenience to the trade would be caused by allowing the Act to come into operation on the 1st of July, he had changed the intention which he had at first formed.

Mr. HUMBERSTON said, he had the honour of attending a deputation to the Board of Trade with the view of obtaining a postponement of the time at which the Act was fixed to come into operation. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion was good enough to assent to the request that a Bill should be introduced in order to postpone the commencement of the existing Act to the first of January. That deputation represented the views of gentlemen in the trade at Chester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Staffordshire, and Newcastle, and those who were present were satisfied that the postponement would take place in accordance with what was stated at the time. They felt aggrieved, therefore, that an alteration in the intention of the right hon. Gentleman should have taken place without having had an opportunity of making a reply; but the real question after all was, whether private machines were to be licensed or not. The feeling of the trade was, that it would insure more satisfactory work, if no testing machines were licensed except public machines or machines at which a man could not test his own work. That seemed a fair recommendation coming from the trade. The members of the Goldsmiths' Company did not test their own work; there was a public assay master to whom they sent their goods to be tested, and the test was accepted all over the world. The chainmakers, for whom he spoke, wished the same principle to be adopted, and he thought it a small request to ask for a postponement for six months. The public would be better satisfied if only public machines were licensed, and to enable a sufficient number to be constructed a postponement to the 1st of January was required. He hoped if the right hon. Gentleman would not introduce a Bill for that purpose, he would avail himself of the discretion which he undoubtedly possessed of not licensing private machines.

Mr. O'REILLY said, the original proposal was for a public testing machine. The clause for granting licences to private testing machines had been subsequently introduced. If he was correct in that statement, it should be taken in connection with the remark of the right hon. Gentleman that security such as was sought for could only be obtained by a public test. A private test was useless. But that was the very question, whether private persons should stamp the Hall-mark on their goods or not. What was wanted was that the stamp should be really what it professed to be, a warrant to the public that the machines did really test. The inspectors of the Board of Trade stated that a great many of the machines which they had tested could be relied on. He would suggest that if the property of private persons were to be licensed there should be such a system of public inspection as should show not only that the machine was once good, but that it continued to be good.

Mr. HENLEY said, the Bill of last Session appeared not to be sufficient for the purpose for which it was required, but he thought it would be a very strange proceeding to call upon the Government to suspend its operation. Next to the machines being good it was essential that the test should be a fair and honest one. In the discussion of 1863 the impression was that the test should be carried on in the presence of public officers, and if that were done it would not much matter to whom the machine belonged, provided it was a good one. A private individual might use it, and probably would use it honestly with regard to his own work; but he doubted if the public could be induced to believe in it unless a public inspector certified to the completeness of the test. He thought the present law wanted amendment in that particular.

THE NAVAL RESERVES.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. CORRY, said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the policy of the Government in relation to the Naval Reserves. There was no branch of our naval organization which offered so great an inducement to short-sighted economy as our reserves of seamen and marines, and there was none, therefore, which required to be more closely watched by those who took a special interest in naval affairs. He was, however, afraid that at a time, when we had so much reason to congratulate ourselves on the formation of a valuable reserve of merchant seamen, the House might find it difficult to understand why he should think it necessary to call attention to the subject. He thought, however, that any such difficulty would disappear on a comparison between the state of the Naval Reserves in general at the present time with what it was three years ago. During this period the Royal Coast Volunteers and the Royal Naval Reserve had increased, but, concurrently with this, the Coastguard, the reserve of Marines on shore, and the reserve of man-of-war's men disposable for the service of the home ports had been reduced. Thus the irregular and imperfectly trained reserves had been increased at the expense of the regular and thoroughly trained reserves, and, as the difficulty we should experience at the commencement of a naval war would lie rather in obtaining the quality than the quantity of men that would be required, he considered this state of things to be eminently unsatisfactory. He considered it to be the more unsatisfactory because his noble Friend, in moving the Estimates, had indicated the probability of further reductions in the Coastguard and the Marines, which were by far the most valuable of all the reserves, and it was in the hope of arresting this retrograde policy that he ventured to direct attention to the subject which he was prevented from doing by unavoidable absence on the night when the Vote for the Reserves was under consideration. The necessity of maintaining large and immediately available reserves at all times, however secure we might feel in the prospect of peace, was forced upon the country by the Russian war. We were then at war only with a third-rate naval Power, and we were in alliance with another naval Power only second to ourselves. Our colonies, our commerce, and our shores were as secure as in time of peace, and the efforts which we were called upon to make were, therefore, insignificant compared with what they must have been if we had been at war with a first-rate maritime State; but, even under such circumstances, we experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining men for the ships it was necessary to commission, and it would have been impossible to do so without the greatest risk of disaster and disgrace, if it had not been for the reserve of seamen we possessed in the Coastguard. But, although the war showed the great value of the Coastguard as a Naval Reserve, it also showed its deficiencies and defects, and immediately after the peace in 1856 his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Wood), then first Lord of the Admiralty, introduced a measure, the principal objects of which were to transfer the management of the Coastguard from the Board of Customs to the Admiralty, and to provide for the gradual increase of the force from about 4,500 to 10,000 men. But even this addition was thought inadequate to meet the contingency of a great naval war; and in 1858 Lord Derby's Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole subject of the manning of the Navy. The spirit of the recommendations made by that Commission was adopted, not only by the Administration of Lord Derby, but by the present Government. The Commission advised that a reserve of merchant seamen should be formed, consisting of 20,000 men, taken from sailors who were never long absent from their ports, that is to say, of men who would be immediately available, and of 5,000 men usually employed on long voyages, and they also advised that the Royal Coast Volunteers should be raised to 10,000 men. These were the principal recommendations applicable to the irregular reserves, and

Mr. Corry

it was also that the Coastguard should be raised to 12,000, that the Marines on shore should be raised to 11,000, and that there should be always 4,000 sailors disposable in the home ports, of whom 1,000 were to be seamen gunners. In 1860, in reply to the late Sir Charles Napier, who had brought forward a Motion on the subject, his noble Friend said he hoped to be able to satisfy the House, before he sat down, that the Admiralty were carrying out one by one the recommendations of the Commission. He stated that he agreed entirely in the expediency of increasing the number of Marines—that the late Government (Lord Derby's) had taken a Vote for 2,000 extra Marines—that the present Government had added 1,000 more—(the very 1,000, numerically, which had been reduced by this year's Estimates)—that the Coastguard was about to be increased by 500 men, and that it was the desire of the Admiralty to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and that there should be a considerable number of seamen in the home ports available for any emergency. These early aspirations of the Admiralty for a time influenced its action. In 1862 his noble Friend informed the House that there were 4,400 trained seamen and boys in the home ports available for service, exclusive of the complements of all the ships in commission; and in 1863 the Navy Estimates provided for a reserve of 10,000 Marines on shore and 10,000 men in the Coastguard. This year, however, the reserve of men disposable at our home ports was reduced from 4,400 to 1,500, as had been stated by his noble Friend, but he doubted, from information he had received, whether he could lay his hands on anything like that number. The Marines on shore, who numbered 10,000 in 1863, were reduced this year to 9,000; the Coastguard, who were 10,000 in 1863, were now reduced to 7,750 men. These reductions showed a diminution of 6,150 men in the regularly trained reserves; and while these men were greatly superior in quality to what any reserve of merchant seamen could possibly be, he doubted whether the whole of the Royal Naval Reserve, set down at 17,000 men, would furnish a force even numerically equal at the outbreak of a war. The reasons assigned by his noble Friend for these reductions were so unsubstantial, that he could not help thinking that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could have given a better explanation, and that the Coastguard and Marines, and the men disposable at the home ports, had been required to contribute to his estimated surplus for the current year. His noble Friend said that the reduction in the number of Marines was a natural sequence of the reduction of the fleet; and he added, with the enviable talent he possessed of making things pleasant, that it would be a great benefit to the force, because Marines lose the characteristics of the sailor unless they have the proper turn of service afloat. But the whole reduction in the fleet, by this year's Estimates, was 1,000 men, and it would be difficult for his noble Friend to show that this rendered necessary a reduction of 1,000 Marines; the proportion of Marines to 1,000 seamen would be nearer 100 than 1,000, and he (Mr. Corry) would observe that the Royal Commission did not lose sight of the necessity of the Marines bearing a proper proportion to the fleet. They stated in their Report—

> "There is a limit beyond which the Marines cannot properly be increased, because it is necessary to their efficiency that they should spend a large portion of their time afloat."

But the Commission, nevertheless, recommend that the reserve of Marines on shore should be raised to 11,000, although at this time the seamen and boys voted were only 37,000, whereas this year the number of seamen and boys was 42,000, so that, in the opinion of the Royal Commission, at a time when the number of seamen voted was 5,000 less than at present, the reserve of Marines might, with advantage, be 2,000 more. The hon. Member for Sunderland, who was a Member of the Commission, had, in a separate Report, recommended that the Marines should be raised to 30,000 men, which he (Mr. Corry) considered an extravagant proposal. In the whole navy, however, there was probably no officer more distinguished for his ability, his experience, or the moderation of his views, than Sir Alexander Milne, who expressed the opinion, in his evidence before the Commission, that it would be an advantage to increase the number of Marines to 25,000, provided the number of seamen was not reduced, and, as already stated, the number of the latter was now 5,000 more than at that period. But naval officers were often supposed to entertain exaggerated notions on such subjects. He would, therefore, quote the opinion of a civilian who could not be suspected of extravagance on any question of naval administration. This year the Marines had been reduced from 18,000 to 17,000, but, in his evidence before the Commission, Sir James Graham said—

> "I should rejoice to see the Marines raised to 20,000, never to be diminished. I saw with great pain the recent reduction of 1,000 men. I regarded that as an imprudent measure."

Hon. Members might think that he (Mr. Corry) attached too much importance to a reduction of 1,000 marines. He was glad, therefore, to be supported by so great an authority as Sir James Graham, and he said, with him, that he saw with great pain the recent reduction (in this year's Estimates) of 1,000 Marines, and that he regarded it as an imprudent measure. He would make only one more quotation from the evidence before the Commission, but it was so apposite to his present purpose that he could not refrain from adverting to it, more especially as it expressed the opinion of an officer of great administrative as well as naval experience—an opinion which his noble Friend could hardly dispute, because it was his own. Lord Clarence Paget said, in his evidence, "I propose to increase the Marines by 6,000." This would have raised the number to 21,000—the Vote at that time having been for 15,000.

> "I should have no hesitation in recommending that increase as a Member of the House of Commons."

His noble Friend, after stating other reasons, went on to say—

> "I have a still stronger reason for recommending an increase of Marines. Our present number of Marines is only commensurate with our number of seamen, and proportionate to the actual wants of the fleet; but we have, or soon shall have, a reserve of seamen of 20,000 men, but we have no corresponding reserve of Marines, and for this reason, also, I recommend an increase of 6,000 men."

So much for the reduction of the Marines as the natural sequence of the reduction of the fleet; and in this opinion of his noble Friend he entirely concurred, for unless there were Marines to embark on board the vessels which would be manned by the reserves of merchant seamen in case of war, it would only be another instance of that want of comprehensiveness which had always been a defect of our naval system. But he (Mr. Corry) considered the reduction of the Coastguard still more objectionable than that of the Marines, and it amounted to no less than 2,750 men in the last two years. The noble Lord would probably say that no reduction had taken place this year in the numbers of the Coastguard on shore, which was by far the most valuable part of the force. Comparing the figures, however, with those of 1863, the Estimates showed a reduction of 500, and, if he was not misinformed, there had been a positive reduction this year, although it did not appear in the Estimates, as he believed the number borne on the 1st of January was 300 more than the number voted. A reduction to this extent had been effected, as he had been informed, not by discharging the older men, but by stopping the introduction of younger hands, thereby increasing the average of age and consequently diminishing the efficiency of the force. The reasons assigned by his noble Friend for reducing the Coastguard were that it was a very costly force, and that its numbers might safely be diminished as we had now a magnificent reserve of merchant seamen; but, so far from regarding the Coastguard on shore as a costly force, he regarded it as very economical, considered as a reserve, for it was the only reserve of seamen giving a return for the outlay on it in time of peace. In 1856, when the management of the force was transferred from the Customs to the Admiralty, the Estimate relating to it amounted to £480,000, an amount which the then First Lord of the Admiralty stated to be wholly inadequate to provide for the protection of the revenue. The additional amount then considered necessary by the First Lord for mere revenue purposes was estimated at about £130,000—making a total of £610,000, and in the year 1863—when a Vote was taken for 10,000 Coastguard men on shore and afloat—the total Estimate was £790,000, or only £180,000 more than what was considered necessary for the mere protection of the Revenue in 1856. It might be said that the treaty with France had rendered it unnecessary to maintain so large a preventive force, but it never was the business of the Coastguard to prevent smuggling at the great emporiums of commerce, but only, as their name implied, on the bare coasts, where brandy and tobacco were the principal articles attempted to be run, and he had yet to learn that free trade had gone the length of admitting brandy and tobacco duty free. He could not pretend to say what was the actual expenditure on the Coastguard now required for the protection of the revenue, but, whatever its amount might be, the difference between it and the entire cost of the force was all that could be charged to it as a Naval Reserve. But the protection of the Revenue was not the only service rendered by the Coastguard in time of peace. It appeared from a return which he had obtained of the value of property saved and protected, and of lives saved by the Coastguard during the last six years, that in that short period the amount of property saved and protected was within a few pounds of £4,000,000, and the lives saved about 4,000, so that the force had in this respect alone almost returned to the country the entire cost of its maintenance, and by diminishing its numbers the Government would be diminishing the means of saving life and property. The other reason assigned by his noble Friend for the reduction of the Coastguard was that he had now a magnificent reserve of merchant seamen. He (Mr. Corry) had always been in favour of forming that reserve, but if he had supposed it was in any respect to supplant instead of supplementing the Coastguard on shore his views respecting it might have been different. It could be no affront to the Naval Reserve to say that it could not be compared, in point of efficiency, with the Coastguard. On the contrary it would be an insult to their understanding to assert that men who received instruction in the special duties of man-of-wars men only twenty-eight days in the year, which might be broken into four periods of seven days each, could be compared with men who must have served eight years in man's ratings in the Royal Navy—many of whom had attained to the rank of petty officers, and the whole of whom were selected in reference to superior qualifications and good conduct. No one had taken a greater interest in, or done more towards the formation of the Royal Naval Reserve than Captain Browne, the late Registrar of merchant seamen; but he held a letter from that lamented officer in his hand in which he stated that, for every 200 of that body embarked for service, from fifty to sixty men should be added from the Coastguard on shore, and this would require from 5,000 to 6,000 of the latter as the proper proportion to a reserve of 20,000 men. Another great advantage possessed by the Coastguard over the Naval Reserve was that it was more immediately available for service. The whole of the Coastguard might be assembled at Portsmouth in forty-eight hours, even from the furthest stations on the coast of Ireland, while he believed the calculation was that not more than one-third of the Naval Reserve could be depended on as being within reach at the commencement of a war. Moreover, the men of the Naval Reserve could not be called out except by Royal Proclamation under an Order in Council. This he had always thought a great defect in the Act constituting the force, for so long as negotiations were going on with a Power with which we had a difference, the issuing of a proclamation calling out the reserves would be tantamount to a declaration of war; and the practical result would be that they never would be called out until after the actual commencement of hostilities. He remembered when he was at the Admiralty, many years ago, and when there was great apprehension of a war with France on the Tahiti affair, the Government would not even allow a single ship to be put into commission lest it should precipitate the war they otherwise hoped to avoid, and, if war had actually occurred, we should have found ourselves in a very dangerous predicament. For these reasons, although he wished to speak of the Royal Naval Reserve with the greatest respect he did not think it ought to be considered as a substitute for the Coastguard. Both the irregular and the regular reserves were many thousand men below the numbers recommended by the Royal Commission of 1858, and he did not think the increase of the former compensated the reduction of the latter. He saw in this reduction a great want of system. The number of men to be voted for the fleet of necessity fluctuated, from year to year, according to the aspect of political affairs on which the Cabinet were alone competent to decide, but the reserves were intended to meet contingencies which could not be foreseen, but which, although unforeseen, were of frequent occurrence in the history of nations, and often arose when least expected. The reserves, therefore, ought to be fixed according to a well considered and well defined scale, and he trusted that, if his noble Friend should announce, next year, a further increase of the Royal Naval Reserve, and a further reduction of the fleet, he would not also have to announce a further reduction of the Coastguard and Marines.

LORD CLARENCE PAGET said, that his right hon. Friend, in objecting to the reduction in the number of Marines and Coastguard on shore, founded his observations on the valuable Report of the Commission on Manning the Navy which sat in 1858. It was true that the evidence of most naval officers, including himself, who appeared before that Commission was to the effect that it was desirable rather to increase than decrease the body of Marines. He had no hesitation in stating that the burden of his recommendations to the Commission was to increase the body of Marines, for at that time the seamen had not got into the admirable system of continuous service. But circumstances had greatly changed since then. At that time the boy system was in its infancy. We had not brought up large numbers of youths who belonged to us, who knew us, and who had acquired a real affection for the service. The Royal Navy, six or seven years ago, was only one among many of the occupations of a seafaring life. A man entered a man-of-war, served in it, and then went into the merchant service. Officers always felt the great inconvenience of that uncertainty in the manning of their ships. The fact was well illustrated in 1859, when a great bounty was offered to induce seamen to go into the Navy. All these things had changed. At that time we had no reserve at all, so to speak ; we had nothing but the Coastguard, and that Coastguard was not altogether so efficient as it had been of later years ; and the reason the naval officers on that occasion recommended a large increase of Marines was that they thought it was a body of men we could always count upon. His right hon. Friend lamented that there seemed a prospect of reducing the Coastguard, which, as he truly observed, was really the nucleus of the reserve force, and which, he added, was necessary for the purpose of providing petty officers in the event of the Reserve being called out ; but the right hon. Gentleman should remember the petty officers and seamen of the navy were mostly continuous service men, and that on board ship there was also a vast number of young men quite fit to make petty officers of. This was a state of things which did not exist formerly. He was not aware of any want in the organization of the navy, except in reference to artificers, and he trusted that shortly the finishing stroke would be put to the means of remedying that want. Many circumstances had contributed to the gradual reduction of the Coastguard on shore. His right hon. Friend had quoted figures to show the necessity of the Coastguard for the protection of the revenue ; but did the right hon. Gentleman think that 5,000 Coastguard were required at the present moment solely for the protection of the revenue? Smuggling was almost a thing of the past, though in certain places of great commerce it was still thought necessary to take precautions against it. In consequence of the changes which had taken place in legislation it was not necessary for the protection of the revenue to keep the force of Coastguard equal to what it used to be; and he had no doubt that, as the result of inquiries now making on the subject, it would be established that a further reduction of the Coastguard on shore might safely, as far as revenue purposes were concerned, be effected. There now existed a large body of Royal Navy Reserve, and he thought his right hon. Friend had not done justice to them. Many Members of the House, and officers who had seen them, reported favourably of them, that they were efficiently trained men. Under good captains of a gun they would be efficient at once on board ship. The right hon. Gentleman stated that one-third of the number could not be considered to be available at any moment. That really was not the case. According to the last return the number was 18,000; those drilled, 16,280; available in from one to fourteen days, 9,000. The larger proportion were thus available in from one to fourteen days. In addition, there was the valuable body of Coast Volunteers, little inferior to the Navy Reserve, because the Act of Parliament passed a year or two years ago introduced a new system, and now more care was taken in the selection of men. About two years ago there was no power in the Admiralty to send these men more than 100 leagues from the shore of this country; but, in consequence of the inconvenience felt therefrom, the Act of Parliament was amended in that respect, and power was taken to send them anywhere. Taking the Naval Reserve at 18,000 men, and the naval Coast Volunteers at about 6,000 men, there was a force of 24,000 men provided by those two bodies. He had described on a former occasion the tendency, by the introduction of armour ships, to decrease in the crews of ships. The armour ships had less numerous crews than the line-of-battle ships. A great change was coming over the service in this respect, but what was lost in numbers was gained in skill, for an infinitely more skilful class of men were now on board ship. At great cost we were training them as gunners, and what was lost in numbers was gained in

skill. If the naval force were analyzed, it would be found that the number of pure blue jackets was not much above 20,000. But, with a reserve of 24,000 men, there existed, in fact, a second navy. It was said that that force could not be called out in case of emergency except by an Order in Council, but he thought that Parliament and the country would soon cry out for the Order in Council to be issued if any necessity should arise for their services. When the Royal Commission recommended a large increase of the Marine force it was, he believed, contemplated that the Marines should garrison the dock ports. He confessed he should like to see those ports garrisoned by them. On the other hand, it must be admitted that our Marines were now just sufficiently employed afloat to afford them that necessary exercise which should give them their sea legs and those sea habits without which they would be useless on board ship, and if they were greatly increased they would not have sufficient sea service to keep them efficient in this respect. The right hon. Gentleman was mistaken as to the process by which the Coastguard were being reduced. A careful medical examination had been going on at all our stations, and a principle of superannuation was being adopted by which about 300 of the older men would be taken from the force. By reducing the Coastguard, men were relieved who were somewhat past their work. He believed that although there had been a decrease of numbers, there was improved efficiency.

INDIA—CLAIMS OF THE SATPOORA AND GOA FRONTIER FIELD FORCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. STANILAND said, he rose to call attention to the claims of the Satpoora Field Force and of the Goa Frontier Field Force (portions of the Indian Army) to the Indian Mutiny Medal, the Government of India having rejected these claims. He regretted to be obliged to bring forward the subject in the absence of the Secretary of State for India, but he hoped that the right hon. Baronet would not deem it discourteous on his part if he could not at that period of the Session defer doing so any longer. He had not the slightest personal interest in the matter, and in calling attention to it he was actuated only by a sense of duty, and a desire to see justice done to an honourable body of men who had fought gallantly and successfully for their Queen in India, in the suppression of the unhappy mutiny and rebellion which broke out there a few years ago. The mutiny was not confined to Bengal, but extended to parts of the other Presidencies, especially to Bombay, where these particular field forces were employed, and their active services were called into requisition against the mutineers and rebels, some of whom were afterwards executed. He wished the House to consider the decision come to by the Commander-in-Chief in India, in opposition to the Governments of Bombay and Madras, in order that these troops might have granted them that medal which it was the express intention of the Sovereign should be given to all who had been engaged in suppressing the rebellion. He would explain the particular circumstances under which the services of these troops were required. In the month of February, 1858, certain native chiefs assembled a considerable force in the immediate vicinity of Goa, with a view to create rebellion against us. They took up a position and stockaded it, making it as defensible as the circumstances would permit. Lord Elphinstone called in the assistance of General Jacobs to suppress the movement, and the operations were under the direction of that distinguished officer. There was no question that the military authorities of Bombay regarded the duty imposed on these troops as the suppression of rebellion. The whole of the testimony on the subject went to establish that the military authorities who were parties to the operation were clearly of opinion that the rising partook of the character of a rebellion. The brothers Saal were the leaders of the mutiny, and the rebels were dispersed by means of a force called the Goa Frontier Field Force acting in the particular locality in question, and consisting of 1,500 regular and irregular troops from the Bombay, and a similar number from the Madras, Presidency, making in all 3,000 men, there were also 1,000 Portugese, and by those troops the rebels were dislodged from the position which they had taken up, and dispersed. General Jacob was summoned to Goa to concert a plan of operations with the Portugese authorities in the following spring, but the leading rebels finding they could not make head against the military arrayed against them surrendered themselves. The Goa Field Force was then disbanded, and the troops returned to their respective districts, and when the whole mutiny in India was at an end an order was sent out awarding medals to all the military and civilians who were employed in its suppression. Colonel Fitzgerald, one of the officers who commanded the combined Goa force, addressed a letter in October, 1860, to the Adjutant General of the army at Fort St. George, making a request for medals, and setting forth the services of those employed under him; but the result was that in proportion as the application for those medals became more numerous the official snubbing given to the applicants increased. In July, 1861, a Minute of Council was forwarded, from which it appeared that the Commander-in-Chief, being of opinion that no military operations had been undertaken against us by the rebels in the particular quarter referred to, decided that there had been nothing to warrant the issue of the medal; it was therefore countermanded, although the home Government had been prepared to grant it, and the medals were actually struck and sent out to India. This gross inconsistency was therefore sanctioned, that a medal was denied to the Bombay force which the Madras army obtained, and were actually wearing. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State would consider this subject during the recess, and be prepared next Session to view the case favourably.

MR. T. G. BARING said, he had been requested to answer the question of the hon. Member, as it was not in the power of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India (Sir Charles Wood) to attend that evening. The case brought before the House by the hon. Member was one that ought, he believed, to be left to the Government of India to decide. The authorities in India had laid down the conditions on which medals were to be given. The regulation on this subject was that for any military force to become entitled to the distinction of the medal, it must have been engaged in actual conflict in the field. A letter had been addressed to the Commander-in-Chief on the subject, and he had stated, in reply, that there was no rule of the service which would authorise the granting of the Indian mutiny medal to the Satpoora Field Force. The hon. Gentleman referred to the decision of the Commander-in-Chief, but he had omitted to state that the Government of India concurred in his opinion. That House was hardly in a condition to discuss the details of military operations against the mutineers, and he therefore hoped the hon. Member would not think it necessary to move further in the matter.

Colonel SYKES said, the House was evidently unwilling to listen to the details of this matter, which he was quite prepared to go into. He should, therefore, confine himself to an expression of opinion that, as a matter of gratitude, the Government ought to have seized the opportunity of doing justice to troops who had stood by us in the crisis of danger, prevented our being driven to the coast, and thus saved our Indian empire.

NAVY—DOCKYARD SUPERINTENDENTS.

QUESTION.

Sir FREDERIC SMITH said, he wished to ask the hon. Member for Pontefract, If there be any valid reason for limiting the tenure of office of the Superintendents of the Royal Dockyards to five years, and whether he will object to furnish a Return showing the length of time which each Superintendent held office since 1841. He had been acquainted since 1815 with all the dockyard superintendents employed at Chatham, and he had never known a single instance in which the officers selected for that post were not men of distinction who had rendered good service to their country. The duties in the dockyards required their whole time and undivided attention. Even the accounts came under their supervision, and he maintained that the working of the system had been attended with rigid economy. He hoped his hon. Friend before the next Session would reconsider the rate of wages of the men, for they were obliged to live where lodgings and provisions were dear, and that he would place it upon a more equitable footing. He hoped also that the Government would not feel restricted to a period of five years for the employment of the superintendents if those gentlemen rendered good service, for no one could become acquainted with the various duties of the dockyard until after a long period of time.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he would not follow his hon. and gallant Friend into all the questions which he had raised, nor would he attempt to revive the debate which had taken place last week upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely). With regard to that debate he would merely say that he would take an opportunity before the House rose to lay some papers upon the table, and to make a statement on the subject. The Return as to the superintendents who had held office since 1841, which had been asked for by his hon. and gallant Friend, should be given. His hon. Friend had asked whether there was any valid reason for limiting the tenure of office by the superintendents to five years. The reason was this, that if it were right that naval officers should become superintendents in consequence of their experience at sea, it was also right that those who had been superintendents should bring their experience acquired in the dockyards to bear upon their duties afloat. To carry out both these objects properly there were decided reasons why the superintendents should not hold office for a very long time, for if so they would soon revert to the old system which existed before the time of Sir James Graham, when the Commissioners of Dockyards held their office for a long period, and the House of Commons put it down. The present arrangement was that the superintendents were appointed for five years. However, the First Lord had a discretion vested in him to re-appoint particular officers for a second period of five years, if their re-appointment was very desirable.

TENURE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that the Report of the Select Committee on the Tenure and Improvement of Land Act of 1860, popularly termed "the Cardwell Act" which had been laid on the table that evening was of extreme importance; and, looking to the fact that this was the last opportunity which Irish Members would have of offering any remarks upon the subject, he wished to say a few words. The Select Committee to which he referred was appointed on the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire) and in moving for it his hon. Friend said that the principle of the Act of 1860, that under no circumstances should a tenant receive compensation without the consent of the landlord, was wrong. He, therefore, asked the House to reconsider the Act for the purpose of amending it. The proceedings of the Committee were published in all the Irish newspapers, special reporters had come over from Ireland to do so, and hon. Gentlemen who had not the honour of being appointed on the Committee attended its sittings, and took the liveliest interest in its proceedings. Members of the Committee wrote long letters to the Irish papers, giving an account of what was being done, and pointing out what would be the ultimate result. Among those letters was one published in the *Nation* of last Saturday, which stated that it was the intention of the Committee to report only the evidence this year, that it would meet again early next February, and after two months would report, and that in the month of April a Bill was to be brought in, with the support of Her Majesty's Government, which was to give to the Irish tenants compensation for improvements, and those other securities which they deemed of so much importance. The letters which appeared in the papers and the speeches which were made on the subject — and they were many — aroused great interest in the minds of a large class in Ireland. He must say he thought the way in which the organs of Her Majesty's Government availed themselves of the sittings of this Committee to announce the fact that Her Majesty's Government were about to introduce a Bill next Session, was most insidious. Suddenly they now learned that the Committee had brought their labours to a close, for their Report had been laid upon the table. In that Report the Committee stated that, having examined several witnessess on the recommendation of the promoters of the inquiry, they were of opinion, while proposing several modifications, that the principle of the Act of 1860 embodied in the 38th and 40th sections—namely, that compensation to tenants should only be secured on the improvements made with the consent of the landlord, must be maintained. But his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire) had said that that Act was practically a dead letter because it was based upon a false principle, and he quoted in his speech—and the same evidence was given before the Committee—the opinion of Judge Longfield, who said that the Act of 1860 must be altered in principle, for everything depended upon so amending it. The Committee also added that several modifications of the provisions of the Act might be made without infringment of its principle, that a lump sum of money might be substituted for a payment from year to year, and the duration of possession might be altered. But these were merely matters of minor detail, the principle of the Act of 1860 being maintained. It was his fortune, with the assistance of his hon. Friend (Mr. Pollard-Urquhart), to have introduced this Session a Bill which had been prepared by the Westmeath Tenant-Right Committee. That Bill embodied the principle which Judge Longfield said was essential, and was in direct variance with the principle of the Act of 1860, but it had not become law. The expectations of the Irish people had been roused, and the organs of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland had availed themselves of the proceedings of the Committee to recommend the Government to the favour of the people ; they stated that the members of the Government were giving the most sedulous attention to the subject, and that in the new Parliament a Tenant-Right Bill would be introduced. Though he differed *in toto* from the recommendations of the Committee, and deeply regretted them, he thought it was much fairer, on the part of the Committee, to have stated their views than that this should be deferred till after the general election. The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Robert Peel) and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cardwell) were both quoted in favour of this Report ; and, therefore, the people of Ireland now knew that nothing would be done. His hon. Friend (Mr. Maguire) was not responsible for this. It was true he proposed the Committee, but he was not responsible for its nomination and everybody knew how such a Committee was nominated. Directly he saw the names he said, "Here are eleven to six against tenant-right," and that was rather a good guess, for it turned out that eleven to six formed the actual division. From the outset he had not the slightest confidence in the Committee, and he regretted that such a Committee should have examined such witnesses as Judge Longfield, and should have come to such a conclusion as they had expressed in their Report.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, he could not tell with what object his hon. Friend had introduced this subject to the House. The Report had not been read by hon. Members, the evidence was not before the House, and save from hearsay his hon. Friend must be quite ignorant of all the transactions. It would be most impolitic at so late a period of the Session to discuss so grave and important a subject. His hon. Friend had referred to a letter which appeared in an Irish paper which held out a promise that the Government would bring in a Bill next year. Now, he was the writer of that letter, and he wrote it because applications to be examined came from all parts of Ireland, and not having time to answer them personally he sought the medium of the press for that purpose. He was led to imagine at that time that the evidence would alone be reported this year, and that in all probability the Committee would be reappointed next year. He therefore said, that the case on the part of the Irish tenantry might occupy a certain time in the beginning of next year, that then there should be an opportunity given for the examination of witnesses on behalf of the landlord class, and that ample time would thus be afforded for the introduction of a Bill which might be brought in some time in April. This was the substance of the letter. It would be wrong of him in the peculiar position which he occupied to force a discussion upon this subject prematurely. His hon. Friend, for some object of his own, which he could not understand, ignored the fact that while the principle of Mr. Cardwell's Bill was enforced and adhered to, the Committee suggested that important modifications might be introduced into that Act with advantage. If his hon. Friend had heard the evidence of Mr. Curling, one of the best witnesses he had ever seen in the the witness-chair, his hon. Friend would have treated with disdain the most important part of the recommendations of the Committee. Mr. Curling had shown better than any man had ever shown what was the real character of the Irish people when they were well treated. He was a man of great experience. For sixteen years he had had the management of a large property in England, and for seventeen years he had had the management of the Devon property in Ireland. Before he came to the management of the property, many an agrarian outrage was committed there. Eleven hundred tenants were in occupation of it, and there were between 6,000 and 7,000 people dependent on it. This tenantry had been well treated, encouraged to improve their holdings, and felt that their improvements were secured to them, and the result was, that though half the population had not a quartern loaf on their table, and hardly tasted meat in the whole year, not a single crime or outrage had been committed there for the last seventeen years. Mr. Curling gave evidence in support of the views of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cardwell), but the rest of his suggestions were important and valuable. I ithe Government did not bring in a Bill, embodying these suggestions, the Members of the Committee must do so, and ask the House to take it up. He did not disdain the Report of the Committee, and he thought it bad policy on the part of Irish Members to treat with scorn and contempt the statement that important amendments would be made, by which he trusted a better state of things in Ireland would be brought about. He hoped it would not be thought that he had entered unduly into this question. The Committee was of his moving; he hoped he had shown temper and prudence as its chairman, and he must submit to whatever decision they arrived at; but though the principle of the Act of 1860 was affirmed by the Report, he believed that the suggestions for amending it which had been made would, if carried out, change the face of the country.

Colonel GREVILLE said, he thought it was somewhat irregular to discuss a Report not yet in the hands of Members, and evidence which was not yet printed; but as a Member of the Committee he completely bore out the statement of his hon. Friend (Mr. Maguire) respecting the letter referred to, which was thought the most convenient mode of notifying to persons wishing to be examined what it was supposed would be the course taken by the Committee. He regretted that the Committee had not pursued that course—reporting the evidence without any expression of opinion, and leaving a future Parliament to take what steps it pleased in the matter. The Committee received valuable evidence, on which a measure might be founded in a future Session, with the view of amending the Act which was the subject of investigation. In such case great benefit would result to the land tenantry of Ireland.

Lord NAAS said, he thought the Committee had, under the circumstances, pursued the best and most honest course. The Committee had examined many witnesses, and propositions emanated from many of them which would never be accepted by Parliament—namely, that compensation should be given to tenants for improvements made contrary to or without the sanction of the landlords. Considering that this was the end of the Session, he thought the Committee had done wisely in expressing a decided opinion on that important point. With regard to the other portions of the Act, there was no indisposition on the part of the Committee to avoid considering the details of the measure with a view to their improvement and to the better working of the Act. But so much misconception existed that he thought the Committee had performed an important public duty in announcing their opinion that no proposition was likely to be entertained by Parliament which would interfere with the rights of property, and which laid down the principle that tenants might deal with the property of their landlords in a mode which the landlords did not think conducive to their interests. He could not but think that when this opinion was entertained by men of all parties it would get rid of the delusion which prevailed, and lead men to consider whether an alteration might not be made which would be entirely consistent with the rights of property and the improvement of the land in Ireland, by facilitating those contracts between landlord and tenant which were the only means of effecting real improvements. He was ready to accept his share of responsibility for the course taken by the Committee. The Government entirely concurred in it, and he did not think any advantage could arise from discussing the matter at the present time. The question was so important that it was beyond the range of party politics. It was whether the House could or could not encourage the improvement of land in Ireland, and whether they would or would not adhere to the rights of property, in the maintenance of which the tenants were as much interested as the landlords.

Mr. C. MOORE said, he must express his belief that the Report of the Committee would be received with dissatisfaction and disappointment in Ireland.

Mr. M'MAHON said, he thought that the House was under obligation to the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) for calling attention to the Report of the Committee. It was the most important topic, as far as Ireland was concerned, that could be brought before the House. The Resolutions of the Committee were substantially what he expected they would be, and instead of sanctioning a measure of tenant-right the Committee produced this abortion of a suggestion—that the Bill of 1860 shoud be amended. Therefore, the principle announced by the Committee was that no improvement could be made in Ireland without the consent of the landlord. This showed clearly the folly of the course pursued by the tenantry of Ireland in reducing their claims from day to day till the whole question of tenant-right was frittered away, and nothing but the name remained.

Mr. LONGFIELD said, he thought the Committee had acted wisely and honestly according to their rights, and beneficially, also, to their country, in making the Report they had done. He had not gone through the evidence, but he was much struck by one thing. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Cloyne had said he thought there were only two courses to be pursued on that question—the one being to give a large and ample measure of tenant-right, and the other being to put an end to the subject altogether. The Committee had adopted the last of these two courses. It had made its Report in a way that would put an end to the question of tenant-right for ever. It would be the guide to Parliamentary legislation for this generation, and would prevent the tenants from looking to tenant-right as a sort of panacea which was to make them rich and happy. In his opinion, the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) deserved credit rather than censure for calling the attention of the House and the country to the matter. The country would now know what they had to expect, and could make their arrangements accordingly, and though he might not agree with the Report if it only put an end to futile hopes of legislation by future Parliaments, he believed it would do good service to the public.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he could not approve the manner in which that matter had been brought forward that evening, because the Report had only been agreed upon that afternoon, and the House had had no opportunity of seeing the evidence or the various propositions which had come before the Committee. The hon. Member for Mallow thought it an advantage that the Report had been brought forward on that occasion, because it would put an end to the questions raised in the Committee; but although the Report represented the opinion of the majority of the Committee, yet it had been only agreed to that day by a majority of three. There had been a strong expression of dissent in the Committee. and the matter was one which must be discussed in the next Session of Parliament.

Mr. CARDWELL: Sir, before this discussion closes, I wish to say a very few words. Whether this discussion will be very useful, seeing that it has been brought on without notice, and that the evidence is not before the House, so that few hon. Members are able to judge as to the course taken by the Committee, is a point which may admit of some difference of opinion. But I am exceedingly glad that we are not about to separate under the imputation of having given an uncertain sound upon this question. Whatever may have been the reasons for this discussion, I think that, at any rate, we should be open to grave reprehension if we permitted the impression to go forth to Ireland that we are at all uncertain about the rights of property in that country. I wish to express my individual opinion that, by whatever name it may be called, compulsory compensation for improvements effected against the will of the landlord is not a principle which is consistent with the rights of property. I express no opinion except my own; but it is my belief that this House of Parliament will not consent to a settlement of this question which assumes as a basis a principle which is at variance with the rights of property. Having had the task intrusted to me of bringing in the measure which has been the subject of discussion, I am most desirous that there should be the most full and free inquiry into that measure, and that every means should be taken for removing any obstacle to its efficient working, and making it, if possible, acceptable and valuable to the people of Ireland. I think that the spirit in which the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Maguire) has from first to last conducted the inquiry is such as entitled him to credit and respect. He does not agree with me in the opinion which I have expressed, and he has never concealed that disagreement; but both in 1860 and now he has been ready to meet those who do entertain that opinion, and to say, "Well, if you do insist that compulsory compensation is not to be given for improvements effected against the will of the landlord, that is no reason why we should not inquire what improvements can be made consistently with the principle for which you contend." I am glad that the Committee has not separated without expressing its opinion distinctly on the questions which have been raised, and I do hope that every effort will be made in all future time, when measures for encouraging the improvement of land in Ireland are brought forward, to give every legitimate facility for such improvements. I wish it may be distinctly understood that only such facilities as are legitimate and as do not interfere with the rights of property

will be sanctioned by Parliament. I am convinced that it is more in accordance with the feeling of a high-spirited people that they should be spoken to in plain terms; and I have that opinion of the Irish people that I do not think they would approve an insincere and uncertain course on an important subject like this, or that they would at all thank the Committee for giving an ambiguous opinion upon it.

MR. ESMONDE said, he hoped it would not go forth to the country that the House had attempted that night to discuss the Report of the Committee or the questions which had been referred to it. For himself, he did not know its precise nature. He only knew that it had been laid on the table; and that the manner in which the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire) had conducted the inquiry had been in the highest degree creditable to him. When the Report was printed, and in the hands of Members, it could be discussed; to do so then was premature. He had seen a letter in an Irish newspaper from the Chairman of the Committee, stating that it was not intended to present the Report this year, owing to the inquiry not having been completed, but that the re-appointment of the Committee would be moved next Session, with a view to resume the inquiry. What, then, was his surprise to find that the Report had been laid on the table that day. He had had no opportunity of reading the Report, and he must say he could not approve the course which had been taken by the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy).

Motion *agreed to.*

House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS (RETIRING PENSIONS) BILL—[BILL 133.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

COLONEL SYKES said, he had to complain of the burden which the measure would cast upon the taxpayers of this country. It was proposed to give to a Colonial Governor who had had a salary of £5,000, a pension of £1,000 after four years' service; a Governor who had been in receipt of a salary of £2,500, would obtain a pension of £750 for life; while Colonial Governors who had enjoyed smaller salaries were to receive proportionate retiring pensions. These pensions would be allowed them quite independently of their having performed any previous service, and it might be paid to them between the age of forty and sixty. Considering, therefore, that we had forty odd colonies, each with a Governor of its own, it was easy to see how costly an arrangement this would be to the public. He looked upon the Bill as a convenient mode of rewarding Government supporters. He thought that, with the professed desire of economy on his side of the House, this measure ought not to have been allowed to go through almost *sub silentio.* By accident he was absent when it was read a second time; but he now felt bound to say that he was no consenting party to the measure.

Bill to be read 3° on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Ten o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, June 24, 1865.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Order No. 179. Sect. 1. *considered* (according to Order): Then it was *resolved*, That this Day shall be considered as a Sitting Day with respect to any Petition praying to be heard upon the Merits against any Bill mentioned in either of the Two Classes of Private Bills, except to any such Bill which was read a First Time on Friday the 16th Instant: (*The Chairman of Committees.*)

Their Lordships having then gone through the business on the paper without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter past Eleven o'clock, till Monday next Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 26, 1865.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee— *Report* — River Shannon (Navigation and Drainage)* (210).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Divine Worship in the Church of England (218); Fire Brigade (Metropolis) * (215); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (216); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Inland Revenue * (221); Indemnity * (222); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) * (223); Compound Spirits Warehousing * (224); Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) * (225).

Second Reading—Roman Catholic Oath (170) *negatived;* Carriers Act Amendment * (198); Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * (211); Rochdale Vicarage * (213); Naval Discipline Act Amendment * (214); Sugar Duties and Drawbacks * (195).

Committee — Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) * (208); Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * (168); Navy and Marines (Wills) * (169); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) * (184); Naval and Marine (Pay and Pensions) * (177); Naval and Marines (Property of Deceased) * (176); National Gallery (Dublin) * (196).

Report — Land Debentures (Ireland) * (193); Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * (168); Navy and Marines (Wills) * (169); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) * (184); Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions * (177); Harbours Transfer * (182); National Gallery (Dublin) * (196).

Third Reading—Partnership Amendment * (162); Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) * (180); Malt Duty * (181); Kingstown Harbour * (188); General Post Office (Additional Site) * (124); Locomotives on Roads * (237); Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment * (205); Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) * (189), and *passed.*

DIVINE WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BILL.

PRESENTED, FIRST READING.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH said, that when he brought under their Lordships' notice, a few nights since, the extravagant proceedings of certain clergymen in the diocess of London, the Bishop of London stated that if any Bill was brought in upon the subject he would give it his support, and in consequence he (the Marquess of Westmeath) had prepared a Bill upon the subject, which he begged to present to their Lordships' House. The Archbishop of Canterbury also stated there was no possibility of their deriving any assistance from the Home Secretary because one Bill in connection with the Church was enough at a time, showing that he was either too lazy, or too indifferent to perform those duties which he had sworn to fulfil. Some measure on the subject was necessary, and he had hoped that a Bill would have been brought in by one of the right rev. Prelates, but as that had not been done he had taken the task upon himself, and hoped to have their support in carrying it into a law. He had, therefore, brought in a Bill for remedying the abuses referred to, and which he would now lay on the table.

A Bill to amend the Law relating to the Performance of Divine Worship in the Church of England—Was *presented* by The Marquess of WESTMEATH; read 1ª. (No. 218.)

STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LORD REDESDALE said, he would now answer to the best of his power the Question put to him by the noble Lord the Postmaster General last week as to the state of the Private business before their Lordships' House. There were now twenty-one opposed Private Bills before Select Committees, and he trusted that the inquiries that had been commenced might be got through in fair time. There had been read a second time that night, or would be to-morrow, twenty-four more Bills which would be opposed in Committee. In many cases the opposition was of a trifling character, and the inquiries would not be likely to occupy much time; but in other instances the objections were of a more serious nature. If noble Lords really felt that it was important to the character of the House to dispose of as nearly as possible all the Bills which were before them, he hoped that to-morrow or next day he should be able to appoint Committees upon all the Bills which were before the House. There were reasons which made it very important in some cases that the progress of Bills should not be stopped. There were some arrangements between railway companies, especially in Scotland, where the companies after contending for a long time had at last come to an agreement among themselves; and it was very desirable, for the interest of the public, equally for that of the companies, that those measures which had advanced so far as they had done, and were not likely to occupy an extraordinary time, should pass during the present Session. There were also one or two other Bills of considerable importance which it was desirable should receive the assent of their Lordships. If he could obtain a fair number of Committees he saw no reason why the business should not be got through in comparatively a few days. It was not desirable to name a very early day as the limit beyond which Parliament would not sit, lest you should provoke opposition, intended merely to defeat Bills by delay. He therefore hoped that if the House decided to go on with the Private business there would be no engagement to conclude the Session upon a certain day. At the same time he might impress upon those having the management of these inquiries, that if either the promoters or opponents of a Bill could not make out their case in a reasonable space of time, there was a fair presumption that it was not entitled to much consideration. No measure ought, on an average—especially if Committees sat every day — to occupy more than a week. It must be borne in mind that many of the Bills which were now before their Lordships might receive amendments, and would therefore have to go back to the other House; but, making all necessary allowance for that circumstance, his impression was that if there was an understanding that, if necessary Parliament would sit till the 13th of July, all the Bills might be satisfactorily disposed of. He did not despair of the business being completed so as to enable the Session to close a few days sooner, but for the reasons which he had already stated he should object to name an earlier day.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that the statement which the noble Lord had made, for which the House was much obliged to him, would be considered by the Government, but at present he would express no opinion upon the subject.

LORD REDESDALE said, that on Monday next he would make a further statement as to the position of the Private business on that day.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Orders 184 and 185 *considered* (according to Order), and amended as follows:—

Standing Order 184. At the end of Section 2 add ("and if the Bill is for the Purpose of establishing a Company for carrying on any Work or Undertaking, the Persons in whose Names any such Deposit is made must be Subscribers to the Undertaking, and their names must appear as such in the Bill"):

Standing Order 185. At the end of Section 2 add ("or that he or they are Persons in whose Names the Deposit required by the Orders of this House is made").

ROMAN CATHOLIC OATH BILL—(No. 170.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DEVON, in rising to move the second reading of the Bill, said, he did so with the unfeigned wish that the task had been undertaken by some Member of Her Majesty's Government—which, he thought, would have been most desirable—or by some noble Lord possessing a greater claim to the attention of their Lordships' House than himself. He was at all times unwilling to trespass upon their Lordships' attention, but on this occasion he felt compelled to come forward in support of a measure which he believed to be one of great national importance. In doing so he felt that one of the chief difficulties he had to encounter was, that upon this question he entirely differed in opinion from many of those noble Lords with whom he generally concurred. But he could not conscientiously shrink from undertaking a task which seemed to him to involve a consideration of justice and expediency. For a long time he had taken a deep interest in the question of the removal of the Roman Catholic disabilities, and he was one of those who, from conviction, as well as from hereditary example, rejoiced in the success of the struggles that had been made for that object; and it would be a matter of satisfaction to him if, by taking charge of this Bill, and introducing it to their Lordships, he was able to complete the removal of the disabilities of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. The Bill he held in his hand proposed a substitute for the oath required by the Act of 1829, and which was substantially re-enacted in the Oaths Bill of 1858, from which it differed in only one or two points. That oath was in these terms—

> "I, A. B., do declare, That I profess the Roman Catholic Religion. I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King GEORGE the Fourth, and will defend him to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to His Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them. And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend to the utmost in my power, the succession of the Crown, which succession, by an Act intituled, 'An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,' is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming, or pretending a right to the Crown of these Realms. And I do further declare, That it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever. And I do declare, That I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this Realm. I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this Realm, as established by the laws: And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment as settled by law within this Realm. And I do solemnly swear, That I never will exercise any privilege to which I am, or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or Protestant Government in this kingdom. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this Declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this Oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever."

There were four parts of that oath to which he entertained the strongest objection. The first part was that in which the Roman Catholic, before he took his seat in either the House of Lords or the House of Commons, or before he could be admitted to a civil office, was called upon to swear as follows—

> "And I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or by any person whatever."—[760.]

Now, if any noble Lord believed that our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen entertained the doctrine which they were thereby called upon to abjure, he would almost be disposed to give up the Bill; but he felt assured not one of their Lordships could entertain that opinion. If, then, that were so, nothing could be more painful to the feelings of the Members of the United Legislature than to compel their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects—men who, it should be borne in mind, had been admitted to an equality with themselves in all civil rights, men holding a high position, and, perhaps, exercising judicial functions; men who, perhaps, had bled for their country on sea or on land, before taking their seats in this or the other House of Parliament, to take an oath in which they had to abjure their belief in a doctrine which not one of their Lordships believed they entertained. He would now refer to the concluding part of the oath, in which Roman Catholics were made to say—

> "And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this

> declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever."—[761.]

Independently of the unjust imputation cast by these words upon those who were compelled to take this part of the oath, there was something in the declaration itself inherently absurd. The oath proceeded upon the assumption that Roman Catholics, unless bound by this declaration, would take it with a mental reservation. Now, he would ask, what possible security did those words afford ?—as of course if, omitting those words, the person could take the oath with mental reservation, why should he not include those words in the mental reservation ? This was such an inherent absurdity as to appear to him one of the strongest arguments in favour of the alteration of the oath. He ventured to hope, from the tone of the debate in the other House, the omission of these two parts of the oath would be unanimously assented to. Passing to the second paragraph of the oath, to which he felt a strong objection—namely, that part of the oath which called upon the Roman Catholic to swear—

> "That I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of the property within this realm as established by the laws."—[760.]

Now, he would ask their Lordships, who were those who were called upon to take this oath ? Were they not men who, equally with their Lordships, were strongly interested in the maintenance of the rights of property ? Were they not men who, equally with themselves, were living under the protection of the same laws ? Were they not men who were mixed up with their Lordships in the discharge of public and responsible duties ? Were they not men who would suffer equally with their Lordships if the security to property were not preserved ? He came now to that which was a very important part of the question to many minds, and which was in his opinion the most important part of the oath, as it raised conscientious scruples in the minds of many of the Roman Catholics who were compelled to take it—namely, that part in which the Roman Catholic was called upon to say—

> "I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by the law within this realm. And I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, or Protestant Government in this kingdom."—[760.]

He spoke as an attached member of the Church of England, and as a man who would yield to none in the conviction of the necessity for the union of Church and State, as a component part of the constitution ; and, therefore, if he felt that striking this paragraph out of the oath would in the least degree endanger the union of Church and State he would not have undertaken to propose such an omission. But he thought it of great importance to consider whether it was right to insist upon a part of the oath which did not prevent Roman Catholics from speaking and voting upon the question to which it referred. Different people had different opinions upon the construction which ought to be put on this part of the oath. Their Lordships were doubtless aware that a late noble Duke felt that he was conscientiously precluded from taking any part in discussions relating to the Church of England. He did not undertake to say whether the noble Duke, who said he could not conscientiously sit and vote upon Church matters after taking the oath, and many others who were of the same opinion, were right or wrong, but their Lordships must also be aware that there were many conscientious Roman Catholic gentlemen who did not feel themselves so precluded from taking an active part in the discussion relating to the Church of England. Their Lordships would admit at once that no man who took an oath ought to be left in doubt as to its meaning by its ambiguous phraseology. The present Roman Catholic oath expressly sinned against that essential principle. In the discussion on the Oaths Bill in 1588, Mr. Gladstone said—

> "If there were these difficulties in the construction of an oath which were held to be of great constitutional importance, that of itself was a clear proof that the matter required the attention of the House, for it was not a subject which ought to be left to A. B. and C. to construe for themselves."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlix. 484.]

But, if ever there was an oath which was construed differently by persons of the same community who had to take it, this Roman Catholic was the one ; and he thought this was a strong argument in favour of abrogating that part of the oath which gave rise to this great ambiguity. He contended, too, that they ought not to trust to oaths for the security of the Established Church, but rather to the increasing earnestness and activity of its clergy. And here, he must observe, that Roman Catholics were not enemies to an Established

Church. In Roman Catholic countries an Established Church was always to be found; and it was notorious that a very great number of the Roman Catholics looked upon the Church of England as the strongest and most permanent bulwark against infidelity in this country. On the other hand, their Lordships were aware that many bodies of Dissenters entertained a feeling of enmity against the Church Establishment. Members of these bodies, he had no doubt conscientiously, spoke and published their opinions on the subject, and exerted themselves in and out of Parliament to subvert the Established Church. Yet no such defence—no such safeguard—was set up against them as was thought to be necessary in the case of Roman Catholics. He contended that if the oath was not required from these men it was unjust to require it of the Roman Catholics. There was a further ground on which he asked for the abrogation of this oath, which had been well expressed by a man, to whose opinions their Lordships always listened with respect—the late Sir Robert Peel. While the Bill of 1829 was under discussion, a proposition was made to still further limit the action of Roman Catholic Members of Parliament; but Sir Robert Peel objected to it, on the ground that it would not be right to limit and fetter the discretion of a Member of the Legislature in the discussion of public questions. Members were returned to the other branch of the Legislature charged by their constituents to deliberate and form an opinion upon all questions which might come before the House of Commons; but then came this oath, which told hon. Gentlemen of the Catholic religion that on certain questions they must hold their tongues. If this system were pushed to the extreme, it is impossible to say where it would stop. In 1829, Mr. Wilmot Horton proposed a clause providing that Roman Catholic Members should be disqualified by law from voting on matters relating directly or indirectly to the interests of the Established Church. In reference to that proposition Sir Robert Peel said—

> "My right hon. Friend has proposed, with a view to calm the suspicions and fears of those who object to the admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament, that the Roman Catholic Member should be disqualified by law from voting on matters relating, directly or indirectly, to the interests of the Established Church. There appear to me numerous and cogent objections to this proposal. In the first place, it is dangerous to establish the precedent of limiting by law the discretion by which the duties and functions of a Member of Parliament are to be exercised. In the second, it is difficult to define beforehand what are the questions which affect the interests of the Church. . . . . I believe there is more of real security in confidence than in avowed mistrust and suspicion unaccompanied by effectual guards. For these reasons I am unwilling to deprive the Roman Catholic Member of either House of Parliament of any privilege of free discussion, and free exercise of judgment, which belongs to other Members of the Legislature."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 758-9.]

On these grounds he ventured to propose the abrogation of the existing oath. He believed it to be ambiguous, unjust, and ineffectual. The oath he proposed in its stead was that prescribed by 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 48, for all except Roman Catholics and Jews, with the substitution of the words "temporal or civil" for the words "ecclesiastical or spiritual," the latter words which Roman Catholics could not adopt in swearing that no foreign Power or Potentate had or ought to have jurisdiction in this realm. In his opinion his proposition was an unobjectionable one; but, unfortunately from the large muster on their Lordships' benches, and from the notice of Amendment given by his noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) he was afraid that the second reading of the Bill was about to meet with a most serious—he hoped he should not be obliged to say successful—opposition. He was well aware that the arguments against the Bill would be urged with all the force which eloquence, ability, and long-tried experience could bring to bear. He (the Earl of Devon) was therefore content to leave to those who were to follow him in support of the measure the task of replying to those arguments, as well as of supplying the deficiencies of his advocacy. But there was one objection made to the measure which demanded some notice from the person charged with moving the second reading, and which lay at the root of all their discussions. It was said that the present oath was the result of a compromise entered into in 1829, and that it was not, he might almost say, competent to the present Parliament to deal with or qualify it. He might ask their Lordships what evidence there was in the discussions which took place at the time of any such compromise—he might ask them to consider the absurdity, he might say, of a compromise with one portion of a great community,—he might refer them to expressions of Sir Robert Peel, declaring that the Bill of 1829 was not the result of a compromise with any party, but a measure brought forward on the responsibility of the Government; but he preferred to argue the point on other ground. He held that in a question of this sort, the Parliament sitting in 1829 had no power to fetter the Parliament that was to be sitting in 1865. In 1829 it might have been necessary to the success of the Emancipation Bill to introduce this oath. That was one thing; but it was quite another thing to say that a Parliament sitting in 1865, with the experience of thirty-five years before it, had not a right to declare that the oath was no longer necessary. He, therefore, put it on the broad ground that the Parliament sitting in 1865 was not fettered by the engagements of the Parliament of 1829. He would further say, that the question might with the greatest propriety be considered at a time like the present, when the existing Parliament was on the point of closing its labours, and the Parliament which was about to be elected would probably contain many new Members. Moreover, he would venture to say that the adoption of this measure would place the statute book more in unison with the spirit of the age. No doubt allusion would be made in the course of the debate to the so-called Papal aggression and the recent Encyclical Letter of the Pope. With regard to the latter, which was remarkable, if for anything, for its singular want of adaptation to the spirit of the age, he would only ask their Lordships whether they thought that the doctrines it contained were likely to meet with any acceptance in the present day with any portion of the population of this country. To the so-called Papal aggression he referred, not with a view of opening up old sores, but simply for the purpose of calling attention to the result of that aggression, which was to elicit such a burst of feeling throughout the country as clearly showed that no repetition of such an act could be of the slightest consequence. After all, those who talked of the dangers they apprehended from such quarters must forget that we were living, not in the 14th, but in the 19th century—that we were living in the days of a free press and universally diffused education—and we need not therefore be deterred by considerations of any such dangers from giving the full relief which this Bill was intended to secure. He had undertaken to ask their Lordships to pass the Bill, because he believed that it was required as the complement to the Act of 1829, and because he felt that the proposal which it contained was a simple act of justice to those who were members of a united Legislature. Apologising for the length of time he had occupied their Lordships, and thanking them for the kindness with which he had been heard, he would now, in conclusion, move the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, in rising to move that this Bill be read a second time this day three months, I can assure your Lordships that it is not without great reluctance that I feel myself compelled to oppose a measure which comes before us recommended by the attractive principle of perfect political equality, irrespective of religious distinctions, which appeals to your sympathies on behalf of those who constitute a small minority of this and the other House of Parliament, and, above all, one recommended to your Lordships by a noble Friend of mine, universally respected and esteemed, in a speech, the temper and moderation of which are calculated to conciliate your Lordships' support. Yet I trust that if your Lordships will honour me with your attention I shall be able to show that it is not wise, that it is not expedient, more especially under the circumstances of the present moment, to adopt a Bill the result of which will be entirely to subvert—I will not call it a compact, for that is a word to which my noble Friend objects—but to subvert one of the leading principles of that great settlement which, after many years of angry and protracted discussion and controversy, at length restored political and religious peace, and which was accepted by those to whom it imparted the full privileges of the Constitution as a satisfactory and complete arrangement of all the grievances of which they complained. My Lords, for my own part, I live in a county which contains perhaps a larger proportion of Roman Catholics than is to be found in any other part of England, which contains a number of old and highly-esteemed families attached to the Roman Catholic faith, with many of whom I am on terms of intimacy, and with some of whom I enjoy relations of close friendship. I have a considerable number of Roman Catholic tenants, and for upwords of forty years I have had the management and control of a property in Ireland which, if not exclusively occupied by Roman Catholics, contains a preponderating number of persons belonging to the faith professed by them; and I defy any human being to say that, either in England or Ireland, whether in social relations or in my dealings with my tenants, I have drawn the slightest difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics. I have treated both on precisely the same terms of equality. This, however, my Lords, is not a social question—it is not a personal question—it is a question of high political importance; and it is to be decided not by personal feelings and wishes, but by considerations which affect the good of the empire at large. My Lords, if I may venture again to say a word with respect to myself, I think in the political course I have pursued for forty-three years I cannot be charged with having neglected the political interests or the fair demands of my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen, whether in this or in the other House of Parliament. I have at all times been ready and anxious to defend the rights and privileges of that Church of which I am an attached member—indeed, the first speech of any importance I made in the other House, forty-one years ago, was one in defence of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, which now seems to be the mark for constant attack; and some of my earliest votes were given in favour of relieving Roman Catholics from those restrictions and incapacities which were imposed upon them, to my mind at least, unjustly and improperly. I do not refer only to the great measure of Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829, to which I gave humble but cordial support, but I would appeal to my Roman Catholic countrymen whether, on more than one occasion, I have not taken a prominent part in relieving them from disadvantages which were imposed upon them, and which affected them in the exercise of their religion or with reference to their religious organization. I have gone so far as to incur, I am afraid, the censure of some of those who sit and usually act with me, and who hold sentiments rather of an ultra-Protestant character. I have not feared to expose myself to their observation and criticism—and even censure—because I felt that the course I was adopting was called for by justice and fair dealing towards my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen. Therefore if, as I have said, I feel myself bound at this time to oppose the progress of this measure, I hope, at all events, that my opposition will not be imputed to unreasoning bigotry, or to hostile feeling towards the Roman Catholic body.

My Lords, I have said that I think it very unwise and inexpedient at this time to introduce such legislation. We are on the eve of a general election, and, closely as parties are now balanced, and comparatively unimportant as the political differences between us have become, and when there is no other question before the public, likely to excite angry passions and lead to personal recriminations—I admit that it may be very good electioneering tactics—I do not deny it—but I say is it wise, is it prudent, is it statesmanlike, is it patriotic, at such a moment to bring before excited constituencies a measure than which none can be more provocative of discussion and controversy, and upon a subject which eminently requires to be treated with the utmost caution, the utmost calmness, the utmost deliberation? Is it for the interest of the Roman Catholics themselves that such a question should be raised at this particular time? Of late years religious animosities have much subsided and religious jealousies have been much appeased; and is it desirable, having regard to the general peace of the various religious denominations, that the Protestant jealousy, deeply rooted in the minds of the people of this country, should have a fresh stimulus given to it; that there should be opportunities given of representing the Roman Catholics as always dissatisfied and aggressive, and, on the other hand, that Roman Catholics should have the means of retorting against those with whom they are engaged in the elections, the charge of bigotry and intolerance? I can conceive nothing more calculated to prejudice the cause of the Roman Catholics, and to peril the removal of any real disadvantages they may labour under, than to bring forward what I would call imaginary grievances at a time of political excitement. Well, then, my Lords, let me ask, by whom is this question brought forward? I remember the time of the old discussions on Roman Catholic disabilities—that long protracted struggle that lasted during the first seven years in which I had a seat in the other House of Parliament—I remember the excitement it produced, and the controversy to which it led. In the year previous to my entrance into Parliament—the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) was then a Member of the other House—I did not come in till 1821—the noble Earl will remember that Lord Nugent presented a petition for the removal of the Roman Catholic disabilities, signed by 8,000 Roman Catholics, including seven Peers, a great number of baronets—in fact, by those who had the best Roman Catholic blood in the country. But those petitioners dealt with real and substantial grievances, and did not put forward imaginary grounds of complaint—for, at that time, the Roman Catholics were unjustly excluded from privileges to which they were well entitled. On the present occasion, where are the petitions? Who are those that bring forward this Bill? What are the vexatious impediments to the enjoyment of the rights of British subjects which they require shall be removed? Where are the Howards, the Cliffords, the Arundells, the Stourtons, the Petres, the Gerards, and the Cliftons? Again, crossing to Ireland, where are the Fingalls, the Gormanstowns, and the Trimlestowns? Where, in fact, are those great historic names who in times of old had proved by their acts the sincerity of their allegiance to the Crown, and served the "Heretic" Elizabeth with as much zeal and devotion as they afterwards showed in their adherence, greatly to their own loss, to the fallen fortunes of the house of Stuart? Not one of them is to be met with now. And why? Because they feel that there is no substantial grievance to be removed, because they do not feel that by this oath they are deprived of any political privileges to which they are entitled. There is not one of them but knows that the restrictions, such as exist, are not only not unjust, that they were not only not imposed by a grudging Protestant Legislature, but that they were actually prepared and framed by Roman Catholics themselves — by Roman Catholic Prelates, by Roman Catholic laymen, by Roman Catholic lawyers, by Roman Catholic statesmen; that they were the conditions on which they entreated and prayed that they might be admitted to a full participation in the privileges of British subjects, which they succeeded, on those conditions, in obtaining in 1829. And they prayed, moreover, as I will show, on more than one occasion, that their co-religionists should not be allowed to sit in Parliament unless they were prepared to take one of those very oaths which my noble Friend (the Earl of Devon) now proposes should be abolished.

I will mention one statement of my noble Friend which rather surprised me. He says, he proposes an oath which, with some slight modification, is the same oath required to be taken by Protestants? What is that slight modification? Let me remind my noble Friend that, in proposing that slight modification he is proposing nothing new, for he is only proposing that which the Roman Catholics now enjoy—exemption from taking the oath of supremacy in the sense of conferring ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction. When my noble Friend speaks of this as being a slight difference, he must be aware that that slight difference is just that, and that alone, which for years before 1829, prevented Roman Catholics from sitting in Parliament.

It is said, why not have one oath? My noble Friend has suggested why we should not have one oath. It was necessary to introduce that slight difference, because, although you allow Roman Catholics, from conscientious motives, to decline assenting to that proposition of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, you are not, I believe, prepared to say that Protestant Members of Parliament shall not, as an essential condition imposed by the Constitution, be called upon to declare their assent to that doctrine of the supremacy of the Crown as independent of any foreign prince, potentate, or prelate with regard to all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual, as well as in temporal and civil jurisdiction. I could, indeed, understand the argument if it were proposed to have one oath; but that is not proposed here. We are now discussing what shall be the terms of an altered oath to be taken by Roman Catholics, and by them alone. In considering this oath of supremacy, it is rather singular to find that from a very distant period of time that oath of supremacy—that declaration of the independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Crown—was an oath not imposed by a Protestant Parliament. It was introduced previous to the Reformation, and was taken to Henry VIII. at a time when the assertion of Protestant doctrines would have led to awkward consequences to the person who professed them. But long after that, in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, the oath was taken without the slightest objection by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. In one of Lord Plunket's most able statements in the discussions upon the question of Roman Catholic relief he made use of these expressions—

"But it was said that those principles were

> altered at the Reformation. There had been no portion of the vulgar history of this country more falsified than that of the Reformation. The very Act of Supremacy, enacted by Elizabeth, demonstrated the false inferences which were drawn from that great epoch. That Act was passed with the view of distinguishing between those Catholics who were loyal and attached to the Throne and those who were disloyal and disaffected. All that Elizabeth required was the same authority, right, and rule over her subjects as was possessed by her predecessors. She would suffer no foreign power to interfere with their concerns. She avowed no desire to intermeddle with her subjects in point of conscience, but she exacted those oaths as the tests of loyalty. This avowal was incorporated in the 5th of her reign, and was made the law of the land. In its very recital it states, 'Whereas the Queen is otherwise sufficiently assured of the loyalty and good disposition of the barons and nobles, be it therefore enacted that they shall be exempted from the operation of this Act.' These words, 'otherwise sufficiently assured,' were evidence that the very measure then contemplated was, at the time, considered as an extended test of loyalty. It was notorious that Catholics continued, after that Act, to sit and vote in Parliament."

That shows that the Act was not directed against Roman Catholics on account of their religion, but as a precaution against suspected disloyalty. And this is the more to be remarked upon because Lord Plunket, who was for so many years the leading advocate of measures for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, in 1821 proposed the introduction of certain words relating to that part of the oath which defines the Royal power in matters ecclesiastical and civil, giving explanations at the same time, of the oath which was imposed by the Act of Elizabeth. [See 2 *Hansard*, iv. 275.] That Bill provided a form of oath proposed by a leading advocate of Roman Catholic claims in 1821, in which he not only called upon them to renounce the principles which were imputed to them, but also proposed to introduce the words which are now objected to—I do not say unnaturally or unreasonably objected to—by my noble Friend, and to take the oath of supremacy in matters of ecclesiastical and spiritual jurisdiction with such modification and explanation as was expressed in the Act of Elizabeth. At the time of the long controversy previous to the removal of the Catholic disabilities, there were certain principles laid down and agreed to—great fundamental bases, upon which the discussion proceeded. Certain imputations were thrown out against the Roman Catholics — I believe unjustly thrown out—against which they thought it necessary to enter a protest and denial; but, as I have said, certain principles were laid down — namely, conditions without which none of their supporters would have brought the question forward: that the Protestant supremacy should be held inviolate; that the Sovereign should be held to be independent of the power of the Pope to absolve subjects from their allegiance; that the settlement of property should be respected; and, above all, that the Established Church should be maintained as an integral portion of the Constitution. Those were not conditions which were put forth by the opponents of the Roman Catholic claims—they were laid down by the advocates and supporters of those claims. It was upon those conditions alone — on the cordial assent of the Roman Catholics to those propositions—that they asked that they should be allowed to share in privileges which they admitted it to be otherwise unsafe to intrust to them. There were also various imputations thrown against the Roman Catholics, such as that it was a doctrine of Roman Catholics that faith need not be kept with heretics, that it was in the power of the Pope to absolve them from their oath, and that the Pope could also absolve subjects from their allegiance. I did not then give credit, and still less now do I give credit, to those imputations; but I must be permitted to remind your Lordships that there is not one of those imputations which may not be traced to some claim which has been put forward at some time or the other by the Supreme Pontiff, and which may not be found vindicated and defended by the casuists whose opinions are received as authority by the Roman Catholics. Surely, my Lords, when such claims are put forward by one exercising such high jurisdiction as the Pope, are put forth in treatises and works professing to give an authoritative exposition of the Roman Catholic faith, it cannot be considered too much—it was not considered too much by the Roman Catholics themselves—that they should be called upon to repudiate such doctrines, and declare that they do not form any part of their religious belief. When the Relief Act passed in 1829, there were certain restrictions imposed—respecting which I will say a few words presently—but they were restrictions imposed by the Legislature with universal consent. Those restrictions were not harsh measures by which the grace of a great act of conciliation was marred, or made to appear as though it had been granted by a grudging Parliament or a reluctant Ministry, but they were provisions which, as I have said, were framed by Roman Catholics, were urged by them, and were pressed on the acceptance of the Legislature by those who advocated their claims. Recollect what were the circumstances under which that great measure of Relief took place. It had been a matter of controversy among most distinguished men and the most able statesmen for many years; it had kept the rival parties aloof; it had distracted and almost paralyzed the action of Government by keeping open a question to which the Government at length yielded, not because they thought it was safe, or because it was free from danger, or failed to feel the force of the objections against it, but because, dangerous as they felt it to be, they saw in the opposite direction dangers still greater. I am far from saying that that was a sufficient justification. The part which Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington had to take was one of great difficulty, and the decision to which they had to come was a painful one. I, who heard it, shall not soon forget the impression which was made upon my mind when Sir Robert Peel spoke of—

"The sharp convulsive pangs of agonizing pride,"

when he found himself compelled to abandon convictions which he had entertained for many years, and at the prospect of the dangers which he saw impending in the country, and which had been sufficient to overcome his own convictions and his own feelings. But, my Lords, it is quite clear that the unreformed Parliament of that day—if it had been reformed, I hardly know that it would have been brought about—was in advance of the opinions of the country in its treatment of the Roman Catholics, and carried that measure against what I believe to have been the strong sense of danger pervading the public mind. The change was forced by Parliament upon a reluctant Ministry, and forced in turn by the Ministry upon a still more reluctant Sovereign; and it would have been inexcusable if this change had not been modified by adding to it every safeguard and provision which could be introduced for the purpose of mitigating the danger which they foresaw, and which was perceived to an even greater extent by the public themselves. The alterations which were made, were, I repeat, practically made at the instance of the Roman Catholics themselves. My Lords, this is so important a part of my argument that, at the risk of wearying your Lordships, I must trouble you to listen to the progress of these oaths, the manner in which they were introduced, the entreaties made to be permitted to take them, and to trace the question down from as early a period as 1757 to 1829. During the progress of the Revolution it is needless to say that the Roman Catholic mind was deeply agitated, and that at that time the Roman Catholics as a body could not be regarded as loyal to the Crown. I would even go so far as to agree, in the words of a very distinguished and eminent person, the late Dr. Doyle, who said —

> "I think at that time the connection of the Roman Catholics with the Stuarts was such as justified, and even made it necessary for, the English Government to pass some penal laws against the Catholics, such as the excluding them from offices of trust, and perhaps even from the councils of the Sovereign; but I think that the necessity which existed, and which certainly would justify, perhaps demand of, the Government to pass certain restrictive laws against the Roman Catholics, could not justify them in passing the very unnatural and harsh laws which abounded in the penal code."

Thus, that eminent Prelate admitted that it would not be safe for the Government not to repress and put restrictions upon the Roman Catholics as a body, not on account of their religion, but on account of their widespread disloyalty. Again Dr. Doyle was asked, in his well-known examination —

> "Inasmuch as that conduct was hostile to the principle of the constitution of England and civil liberty, are you of opinion that they were in that degree justifiable?"

Answer.

> "I do think they were justifiable; nay, that it was their duty to pass restrictive laws against the Catholics, considering the political principles of the Catholics of that period."

Well, towards the middle of the eighteenth century public opinion had very much changed, the new dynasty had become established, and the cause of the Stuarts was felt to be irretrievably lost. The settlement of property under Charles II. had been recognized; and, in speaking of this settlement, we do not refer to the settlement so far as it affected the general right of property in individuals, but we refer to that great Act of Settlement of property introduced by the Duke of Ormond in the time of Charles II. for the purpose of removing the restrictions introduced in the time of Cromwell, and of restoring the titles and estates to those who had been deprived of them. In 1757 the Roman Catholics framed an oath which proceeded on the basis of this Act of Settlement, and it was a portion of that oath to maintain and uphold the settlement of property as by law established; and this is remarkable, as from 1757 to the present time no word of remonstrance or opposition has been heard on their part. In 1787 a "declaration of the Catholics of Ireland" was framed by an Irish Catholic Bishop, Dr. O'Keeffe, in conjunction with Mr. O'Connor, of Belenagore, Dr. Curry, and Mr. Wyse, of Waterford; and these are the words:—

> "Whereas certain opinions and principles inimical to good order and government have been attributed to the Catholics, the existence of which we utterly deny; and whereas it is at this time peculiarly necessary to remove such imputations and to give the most full and ample satisfaction to our Protestant brethren that we hold no principle whatsoever incompatible with our duty as men or as subjects, or repugnant to liberty, whether political, civil, or religious. Now we, the Catholics of Ireland, for the removal of all such imputations, and in deference to the opinions of many respectable bodies of men and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby, and in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this our deliberate and solemn declaration. It has been objected to us that we wish to subvert the present Church Establishment for the purpose of substituting a Church Establishment in its stead. Now, we do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any such intention; and, further, that if we shall be admitted into any share of the constitution, by our being restored to the right of the elective franchise, we are ready in the most solemn manner to declare that we will not exercise that privilege to disturb and weaken the establishment of the Protestant religion or Protestant government in this country."

This was a declaration signed by Roman Catholics, and prepared by a Roman Catholic Bishop; it was issued also in 1792—the original is in my hand and in it they disavow all the other opinions to which I have referred; and they go on to say—

> "We do hereby solemnly disclaim and for ever renounce all interest in and title to all forfeited lands, resulting from any rights or supposed rights of our ancestors, or any claim, title, or interest therein; nor do we admit any title as a foundation of rights which is not established and acknowledged by the law of the realm as they now stand. We desire further, that whenever the patriotism, liberality, and justice of our countrymen shall restore to us a participation in the elective franchise, no Catholic shall be permitted to vote at any election for Members to serve in Parliament unless he shall previously take an oath to defend, to the utmost of his power, the arrangement of property in this country as established by the different Acts of Attainder and Settlement."

Your Lordships must forgive me for dwelling on this matter, because I wish to show you that what is now complained of was recommended during a series of years in every application from the Roman Catholic to be admitted to the privilege of the franchise. In 1792 a petition was presented to the Irish Parliament from the Roman Catholics of Ireland which contained the following:—

> "With regard to the constitution of the Church, we are indeed inviolably attached to our own. First, because we believe it to be true; and next, because beyond belief we know that its principles are calculated to make us good men and good citizens. But, as we find it assures to us individually all the useful ends of religion, we solemnly and conscientiously declare that we are satisfied with the present condition of our ecclesiastical policy. With satisfaction we acquiesce in the establishment of the National Church; we neither repine at its possessions nor envy its dignities; we are ready upon this point to give every assurance that is binding upon man."

In 1792 that application was made to the Irish Parliament; and in consequence, in 1793, the Roman Catholics, upon taking these oaths and making these declarations, were admitted to the exercise of the franchise. It is remarkable that so early as 1793 the Irish Parliament granted to Irish Roman Catholics that which the English Parliament never granted to the English Roman Catholics until 1829. I come now to a petition presented to the Imperial Parliament in 1808, and I find there—

> "Your Petitioners most solemnly declare that they do not seek or wish in any way to injure or encroach upon the rights, privileges, possessions, or revenues appertaining to the bishops and clergy of the Protestant religion as by law established, or to the churches committed to their charge, or to any of them; the extent of their humble supplication being that they be governed by the same laws, and rendered capable of the same civil and military offices, franchises, rewards, and honours, as their fellow subjects of every other religious denomination."—[1 *Hansard*, xi. 493.]

In 1812 there was a similar declaration; and in 1813 Grattan, the most energetic, able, and eloquent defender of the rights of the Roman Catholics, declared in the preamble of the Act which he introduced, that—

> "The Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland was established permanently and inviolably, and that it would tend to promote the interest of the same, and to strengthen the free constitution of which it is an essential part, if the disqualifications under which the Roman Catholics laboured were removed."

I now pass to the speech made by Lord Plunket in 1821, in support of the property of the Protestant Church, in which he, one of the most able and eloquent supporters of the Roman Catholic claims, says—

"Could I believe that the measure of redress involved consequences of injury or of danger to those establishments, dear to my heart as I hold the interest of my Roman Catholic countrymen, I should abandon their long-asserted claims and range myself with their opponents. But, having the most entire conviction of the groundlessness of the apprehensions, and entertaining a sanguine hope that such alarms may be removed from the minds of those who are sincere,"

and so on. Again, in the same speech, Lord Plunket says—

"On the part of the Roman Catholics I am bold to say that though they prefer their own religion to ours, yet that they find the Protestant religion established by law, by the same law by which their own lives, liberties, and properties, along with those of all the other subjects of this realm are secured; that, on the contrary, the Protestant established religion of England was in Ireland established at the Reformation, confirmed at the Reformation, and perpetually incorporated at the Union; that it forms a part of the fundamental, unalterable law of the empire; that he, therefore, prefers a Protestant establishment and an unimpaired state to a Roman Catholic establishment and a subverted one; that he considers the possessions of the Protestant clergy as their absolute property, secured to them as sacredly as the private possessions of any individual are secured to him: that he abides by the oath which he has taken to maintain that Establishment, and that, so far from consideriag himself under any obligation to subvert it, he holds himself obliged by the most solemn ties which can bind him to society as a man, a citizen, and a Christian, to resist all attempts at its overthrow from whatever quarter they may proceed."—[See 2 *Hansard*, iv. 979.]

This is the language of the authorized advocate of the Roman Catholics, and I shall not quote a word from any of the opponents to their claims, but from their own advocates, who state their own convictions in their own terms. In 1825, again, Archbishop Murray, a most excellent and amiable prelate, with whom I have had the honour of having held personal intercourse, and whom I believe to have been utterly incapable of deviating from his pledged and plighted word—a man devoted to his own religion, but, at the same time, scrupulously alive to the claims of others, was examined before a Committee of the House of Commons. Some of the questions and answers were remarkable.

"Have you any reason to think that, in the minds of any part of the Roman Catholic clergy, there exists any hope or any wish to interfere with the temporal possessions of the Established Church?—Answer. Not the least; there is no wish on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy to disturb the present Establishment, or to partake of any part of the wealth it enjoys. Question. Nor any objection to give the most full and entire assurance on that subject, by any declaration that may be required of them?—Answer. Not in the least."

Again, in 1826, there was a document signed by thirty Roman Catholic bishops, in which they

"declare upon oath that they will defend to the utmost of their power the settlement and arrangement of property in the country as established by the laws now in being. They also disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead. And further, they swear they will not exercise any privilege to which they are, or may be entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in Ireland."

This document was signed by thirty Roman Catholic bishops, of whom one only is now alive, and he cannot be charged with the endeavour to disturb the Protestant Establishment—Archbishop M'Hale—for, bound by his own declaration and by the assurance which he gave, he has persistently refused to join an Association presided over, I regret to say, by another prelate of his Church, formed for the express purpose of subverting that very Protestant Establishment which other Roman Catholics, at their own request, are bound by oath not to endeavour to overthrow or weaken. This refusal, I think is greatly to the credit of Dr. M'Hale, particularly when we bear in mind how zealous he is in the advocacy of his own religion. It is clear that he must feel himself bound by the sense which he entertains of the voluntary engagement into which he entered to refrain from cooperating with a brother prelate in a movement which has for its object the injury of a Church to which he as much as any one is opposed. I will not trouble your Lordships with the evidence upon these declarations further than that which was given by Mr. O'Connell and Dr. Slevin, Professor of Canon Law in Maynooth. They declared that there could not be a shadow of a pretence for any of those who were formerly interested in forfeited property in Ireland seeking to reclaim it and to reverse that settlement of property. In a speech of Lord Plunket's in 1828—he had been admitted a Member of your Lordships' House in the previous year—he said—

"If I could agree in believing that we can take no step for the admission of Roman Catholics into Parliament and into office without the destruction of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, I, who have supported these claims almost from the first moment I could think, would abandon my ancient and confirmed opinions would change my side and become as determined an opponent to concession as I have been its most anxious advocate. I look on the Protestant Establishment of Ireland as a fundamental principle of our Imperial constitution. I take it to have been unalterably settled at the Union, and that to talk of changing the Protestant religion of Ireland without shaking the Protestant Establishment of the empire, is idle. I speak no new language. . . . . On these grounds, and not for any fanciful and theoretical reasons assigned by some writers upon this subject, I never for a moment would consent to anything which should endanger the Protestant Establishment. I further feel that the Protestant Establishment of Ireland is the very cement of the Union. I find it interwoven with all the essential relations and institutions of the two kingdoms, and I have no hesitation in admitting that if it were destroyed the very foundations of public security would be shaken, the connection between England and Ireland dissolved, and the annihilation of private property must follow the ruin of the property of the Church."—[2 *Hansard*, xix. 1260.]

Such is the declaration of one of the most persevering, able, and eloquent supporters of the Roman Catholic claims, with respect to the maintenance of the Church Establishment, which the oath we are now asked to repeal was intended to protect and secure. It would, I may add, be a gross injustice to the memory of Sir Robert Peel to suppose that he introduced this oath merely for the purpose of satisfying public clamour, and not with the conviction that it would, to a certain extent, operate as a restraint on those Roman Catholics who, from conscientious motives might be desirous of disturbing the Roman Catholic church, but would be prevented from doing so by the obligations of the oath.

My Lords, having said thus much as to the history of this oath, let me now proceed to analyse the oath as it stands, and follow my noble Friend who has read through the oath. I am quite ready to agree with my noble Friend so far; I am quite ready to assent to such an alteration as shall relieve the Roman Catholics from the obligation of taking any declaration or renouncing any doctrine or principles the supposed adherence to which they would consider an injurious reflection on their private honour. I draw, however the widest distinction between the several grounds on which the abolition of the several parts of the oath is advocated. There are portions of the oath—such, for instance, that in which they are called upon to abjure and renounce that which, if they professed, would be a matter of moral turpitude—although these were inserted without any objection from former generations of Roman Catholics, yet if it grates on the feelings of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen I think it unnecessary, and I agree with my noble Friend that I would not hesitate to strike out this portion of the oath. There is another part of the oath which my noble Friend dwelt upon—that whereby the person who takes the oath declares that he takes it without any mental reservation or equivocation which, if it be offensive to Roman Catholics, I would sweep away, provided it can be done without hazard to points of real and vital importance. It happens, singularly enough, that this oath and the declaration that the Pope has no power to absolve are taken by no less a functionary than the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and though no Lord Lieutenant has entertained a contrary opinion, I never heard of a Lord Lieutenant who hesitated to declare that he took the oath without mental reservation or equivocation. But, again, I agree with my noble Friend that the man who would equivocate in taking the oath would declare that he took it without mental reservation; therefore, if it is offensive to the Roman Catholics, provided I can see that it can be expunged without risk to obligations of more vital importance, I will not hesitate for a moment to agree to expunge it. I may be asked if you are willing to dispense with a considerable portion of this oath? Why is it you do not assent to the second reading of this Bill? Why do you leave yourselves open to misrepresentation and misconstruction? Why do you not introduce such Amendments as you think necessary, expunging that which you think immaterial and retaining that which you think is an essential portion of the oath? That is a very fair question, and I will give it a fair and frank answer. In the first place, that very proposition was made in the House of Commons, and was by the House of Commons rejected, and I think the occasions are very rare where your Lordships would seek to call upon the House of Commons to affirm an Amendment which, upon full deliberation and discussion, they have already rejected. I lay that down as a general rule, but not one without exception. I was so anxious to avoid the necessity of calling upon your Lordships to give a vote which might by possibility be misconstrued against the second reading of the Bill that I addressed myself to Her Majesty's Government, and said if they would consent to lend the influence of the Government to retaining in the House of Commons and restoring to the Bill those portions of the oath which I conceived to be important and essential, I would, for my part, very readily abstain from offering any opposition to the second reading of the Bill; that I would take their assurance that they would use their influence to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. And I repeat now, that if the Government, on full consideration, think that such an arrangement might be advantageous to the interests of religious peace—might be satisfactory to the Protestants—might remove some portion of the objections of the Roman Catholics—I am ready to say that if I receive that assurance to-night I will even now abstain from asking your Lordships to offer any opposition to the second reading of the Bill. But if I am told by the Government that they cannot assent to such an alteration, that they cannot assent, in point of fact, to the Bill except upon the condition that it does away with all the security provided for the Established Church in Ireland and for the settlement of property in that country, I am bound to take the course of opposing the measure as a whole. With regard to that portion of the oath which I think is indispensable—and I do not say that that portion which refers to the settlement of property is at this day indispensable; but this I know—and I shall be confirmed by many noble Lords connected with Ireland—that there exists in the minds of the more ignorant of the peasantry and lower classes in Ireland, even at this day, a belief that the time is to come when estates are to return to their former owners; that maps are kept of forfeited property, in the hope that those they call the rightful owners will be again put into possession. That is a wild hope, I admit, and one that could enter only into no imagination less sanguine than that of an ignorant Irish peasant; but, if they see in Parliament a Bill for expunging from the oath that part which has reference to the settlement of property, will not their ignorance and sanguine temperament lead them to be encouraged in the extravagant expectation that the Protestant party and the Imperial Parliament do not hold to that settlement as an essential part of the constitution of these kingdoms?

My Lords, I have heard two objections to the oath as it at present stands; first, that it is ambiguous, and second, that it is not binding; or, if it is binding, it is only binding upon scrupulous and conscientious minds, and not upon those who desire an excuse to satisfy their consciences. This latter observation applies to every oath. I do not suppose that the oath of allegiance ever bound any person who was disposed to rebel, and yet you call upon all persons to take it. My noble Friend in his amending Bill does not propose to exempt Roman Catholics from taking that or any other oath which Protestants are called upon to take; but, he says, that the oath is ambiguous, and he stated that to my great surprise. He says different people take different views with regard to the obligations and restrictions under which the oath places them; and that it is in the judgment of many men a prohibition to Roman Catholics taking any part in the discussion of Church questions. I was surprised to hear my noble Friend, in defence of that interpretation, quote a passage from Sir Robert Peel, which appeared to me to have an entirely contrary significance. He says that Sir Wilmot Horton proposed to introduce a clause for the purpose of inserting an express prohibition against Roman Catholics dealing with Church questions. What was Sir Robert Peel's answer? He said—

> "I propose to make this a settlement so final and so complete that no one shall be entitled to say that it debars him from his public liberty and fetters him in the course he should pursue, except in the exception expressly laid down in the oath."

Not binding? I could point to noble Lords and to Members of the other House—I could point to a very learned Roman Catholic Judge, of the highest character, who declares most solemnly that so long as that oath remains on the book, he should hold himself bound by the strictest religious ties to do nothing to weaken or disturb the Protestant religion or the Protestant Government. Another very distinguished Roman Catholic, the late Mr. Lucas, said, that he would as soon think of uttering blasphemy, as of giving a vote that he believed to be prejudicial to the interests of the Established Church. I know that the same principles have regulated the conduct of noble Lords in this, and hon. Gentlemen in the other House of Parliament. When you speak of the oath being ambiguous, in what sense can it be ambiguous? The person who takes it swears that—

> "I will never exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or the Protestant Government of the United Kingdom."

Does that swear that he shall not legislate upon Church questions? Not in the least. If in his inmost conscience he believes that the measure which he is advocating is one not for the injury but for the benefit of the Established Church, he is as completely at liberty to legislate upon that question as is any Protestant Member. Why, I myself brought forward some years ago a measure which reduced the number of Bishops in Ireland, and altered the distribution of the property of the Church, infinitely, as I think, to the Church's advantage. Many Roman Catholics supported that Bill, and they supported it, believing conscientiously and honestly that it was not a measure for the weakening or disturbance, but, on the contrary, for the strengthening and support of the Established Church. What motive a man has for a particular vote is known only to God and his own conscience, and no one can judge the motives from which he takes a particular course; but it is, I apprehend, as clear as day that a Roman Catholic Member is precluded from giving any vote which in his inmost conscience he believes will be injurious, or which he intends and designs should be injurious to the Protestant Establishment or the Protestant Government. Therefore, in opposition to my noble Friend, that this oath is no real security to the Established Church, I hold that it is to a certain extent a security to that Church. It is a recognition by Parliament of the inviolability of that Church as a portion of the Constitution; it is binding upon honourable minds, and other minds we cannot expect to bind by any oath. It is not ambiguous if men will look at it clearly in the light of those who framed it and imposed it. I believe it has acted as a protection to the Established Church, and I believe still further that its removal would be a serious injury and a heavy blow to that Church, and that it would indicate a disposition on the part of Parliament, which, however it may be professed, even in high quarters, I trust will not receive the sanction of your Lordships or of the other House of Parliament.

My Lords, in the course of the debate elsewhere an hon. Gentleman used an expression which was certainly more forcible than elegant. He said that "the object of this Bill is to unmuzzle the senators." Unmuzzle them for what purpose? In dealing with the former part of the oath they say that it is not only unnecessary, but injurious, because it calls upon them to repudiate, in words, doctrines which they never desire to sustain; but when you come to the latter part of the oath which deals only with a *malum prohibitum*, and not a *malum in se*, the only bar to which is a legislative prohibition, but yet one which we Protestants and which the people of this country maintain to be an important principle, and one which ought to be steadily adhered to and guarded by every safeguard which the law can throw around it—when you come to that, what is the argument? Not that "we have not the least intention of doing that which you propose to prohibit." No, it is "because we desire to do the very thing which you wish to prohibit—unmuzzle us." "Unmuzzle us," says an hon. Gentleman who has lately been returned for an Irish county by the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood —"unmuzzle us;" and why! Because we are harmless? No. "Because we want to bite?" If a man comes to me with a dog with a muzzle on and says, "Take the muzzle off this poor creature; he will do us no harm, he is quite harmless, and, besides, the muzzle is half-rotten and affords no great protection," I understand him; but if he says, "This is a most vicious animal, and nothing prevents his pulling you and me to pieces except the muzzle which is put round his nose, and therefore I want you to take it off," I am inclined to say, "I am very much obliged to you, but I had rather keep the muzzle on." The very argument which is made use of to induce us to take the muzzle off is in direct contradiction to the ingenious contention of my noble Friend that, in point of fact, the restraint is perfectly inefficacious; that it is only a vexatious impediment, and not one which affords any real protection.

I feel deep regret at having detained your Lordships so long, but I wish to place distinctly before you and the country the position in which I stand, and in which I desire to stand. For forty-three years I have been anxious to extend the fullest amount of civil and religious liberty to all my fellow-countrymen. I have invariably supported every claim of the Roman Catholics which I did not conceive to be injurious to or destructive of that Church of which I am an attached member. I believe that the removal of restrictions which do not really impose any burden or any hardship upon the Roman Catholics, who have obtained their present position in virtue of taking that oath, will be worse than useless, and will open the door to serious attacks upon the Protestant Church of Ireland. Is this the proper moment to select for taking off any of those restrictions which form the safeguards, however slight, for the security of the Protestant religion? Can we say that there is no desire at the present time on the part of a large portion of the Roman Catholics to subvert and destroy the securities for the Established Church in that country? Can we say so in the face of the statements put forth in reference to the approaching election—that Members will be returned for the especial object of subverting that Church? Is this the moment to relax our vigilance when, from persons as high in authority as a Minister of the Crown, the Church of Ireland is held forth as an object not for immediate assault, but for assault at no distant date; and, with that knowledge and conviction, are you prepared not now to come to a vote that that Church be destroyed and overwhelmed, for that would be the honest course, but to take with your eyes open, and with these declarations made to you, measures relative to Roman Catholics which will pave the way for the contemplated attack, and leave the walls of the fortress absolutely undefended and open to the first assault made against it? If this measure was to have been brought forward at all, it should have been brought forward after serious investigation of the arguments by which the restrictions were supported at the time of the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill; it should have been brought forward with the full strength and authority of the Government, who should not have sheltered themselves, as they have done on the present occasion, under the wing of a highly respectable, but still private but unimportant individual. The Ministers should have come forward in support of the measure with the authority of the Crown and of the Government, and there should have been a clear statement of their intentions and objects. They ought not to have allowed this question to have been thrown upon the House in the loose way it has been, hastily and inconsiderately, when the public mind is about to be excited by a general election. If I could have relieved the Roman Catholics from that which they feel degrading and harsh, I should have only been too glad to have joined in sweeping away that which is considered superfluous and offensive, if Her Majesty's Government would have permitted me to do so; but they say, "No, you shall not strike out this part of the oath, unless you consent to strike out that part of the oath which was intended to be a safeguard to the Established Church," and the removal of which would agitate the Protestant mind of the country, and would encourage the Roman Catholics to commit assaults upon the Church which appears to be about to be abandoned. If upon these conditions alone I could confer the boon I should desire upon the Roman Catholics, I should have no alternative but to stand by that Church which I have supported from the earliest period I could think, and which I am not likely to abandon for any fanciful advantages at the time when I am approaching the confines of the grave.

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

Earl RUSSELL: My Lords, I think it was quite unnecessary for the noble Earl who has just sat down (the Earl of Derby) to tell us, as he did, that he opposed the second reading of this Bill with no prejudice against the Roman Catholic body, and that it was not with any enmity towards religious freedom that he approached this grave question. I agree with the noble Earl that it is no light matter to reopen the Roman Catholic question by proposing an alteration in the Roman Catholic oath after its settlement thirty-six years ago under circumstances which should make your Lordships reflect seriously before you alter the oath then imposed. But, how does the question now come before your Lordships? A most influential section of the Roman Catholic body declares that the retention of certain parts of the oath is a grievance to Roman Catholics. The noble Earl said, that but few Roman Catholics complained of the burden imposed upon them by the oath; but, on the contrary, I believe that the great body of the Roman Catholics object to it, as those who are not compelled to take it themselves sympathize with those who are compelled to take it, and they regard it as the great mark of inferiority which attaches to their religion in this country. There are several objections to the words of the oath. I will now allude to those portions to the alteration of which the noble Earl has so readily assented. One part of the oath, the omission of which he does not object to, is this—

> "I do renounce, reject, and utterly abjure the opinion that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 760.]

Now, the noble Earl is not desirous of imposing that part of the oath upon the Roman Catholics, because he does not regard the principles abjured as forming a portion of their belief. Another part of the oath which is a matter of offence, and which the noble Earl would also not object to see omitted, is that part which refers to the "mental reservation." But when the noble Earl says he communicated to the Government his readiness to part with these words of the oath, it appears to me that he takes away one of the great objections to the Bill; it appears to me that the chief objection to making any alteration in the oath must be that the matter has been settled years ago by the wisdom of Parliament with the consent of all parties—and that settlement ought not to be disturbed. But surely, if once you consent to make any alteration in the oath, you should remove all parts of it which are regarded by Roman Catholics as peculiarly offensive in these times, and which really form in their minds a substantial grievance. My objections to the parts of the oath which the noble Earl wishes to retain are that they are contrary to the spirit of the Relief Act, and that they are in direct contradiction to the spirit of the present age; and, finally, that they form no security whatever for the Protestant Church. It was urged by the noble Earl that we ought not to make this concession, because the oath formed part of the conditions of the compact under which the Roman Catholics were permitted to enter Parliament; but I deny altogether that any such compact exists. During the long contest which preceded the Relief Act of 1829, Grattan, Plunket, and others, with the view of obtaining the consent of Parliament and removing the jealousies of Protestants, offered various securities—the noble Earl has referred to the securities offered in 1757 and 1793—but they did not obtain the assent of Parliament. At the end of the long Parliamentary contest, when it came to be a question between Earl Grey on the one part and Mr. Canning on the other, Earl Grey, that most illustrious defender of the Roman Catholics in this country, said to Mr. Canning—

> "You ask me for security; show me your danger, and I will show you my security."

Mr. Canning said—

> "I am reproached and taunted with not going on demanding security, as in former years; but I don't think there is any necessity for exacting any such security, and all former proposals for security have been rejected. The principle to be acted upon is that there should be mutual concession."

This was the spirit in which both the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel regarded the question when they proposed the great measure of Catholic emancipation in 1829. Sir Robert Peel, in the latter part of his speech, said—

> "There appears to me numerous and cogent objections to this proposal. In the first place, it is dangerous to establish the precedent of limiting by law the discretion by which the duties and functions of a Member of Parliament are to be exercised. In the second, it is difficult to define beforehand what are the questions which affect the interests of the Church; thirdly, by excluding the Roman Catholic from giving his individual vote, you do little to diminish his real influence if you leave him the power of speaking, of biasing the judgment of others on the question on which he is not himself to vote; and if by a jealous and distrusting, but ineffectual, precaution you tempt him to exercise to your prejudice the remaining power of which you cannot, or do not, propose to deprive him."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 758.]

That is what you do at this moment by depriving the Roman Catholic of an equal position with the Protestant. The noble Earl states that if you take away this security from the oath you enable the Roman Catholic to say that he is free, if he thinks proper, to endeavour to subvert the Church Establishment, and you then let in a flood of danger upon that Church. But the noble Earl forgets—and it is the gist and point of this whole complaint—that that right which you tell the Roman Catholic he is not to exercise, and that right of which he is to be deprived, you freely allow to the Protestant. Protestants may belong to Liberation Societies; they may say they think that an Established Church is altogether wrong; that it is an injury to religion to have any State endowments. And, therefore, you give to the Protestant that very power which you attempt by this oath to withhold from the Roman Catholic. What is the consequence of that? Why, the very consequence which Sir Robert Peel points out. Roman Catholics in Ireland, moved by several reasons, and, perhaps, by the notion that this oath might prevent Members of their own faith from voting to take away the revenues of the Established Church, have elected Protestants who can use this very power, and who come forward in the House of Commons to declare that their object is to subvert the Church Establishment, and deprive it of its revenues. There is, then, this inconsistency, that you allow to Protestants that which you say must not be allowed to Roman Catholics. Then Sir Robert Peel says—

> "I believe there is more of real security in confidence than in avowed mistrust and suspicion unacompanied by effectual guards. For these reasons I am unwilling to deprive the Roman Catholic Members of either House of Parliament of any privilege of free discussion and free exercise of judgment which belongs to other Members of the Legislature."

Yet, by the words of this oath, according to what may be its right interpretation, you do deprive the Roman Catholic of the power of exercising his judgment on any question relating to the revenues of the Established Church. I now come to that part of the oath which relates to the settlement of property. Here are the words of the oath—

> "I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 760.]

Now, although in the year 1757, when this question was discussed, there were, no doubt, many who thought that the ancient settlement of property might be disturbed, I doubt whether there be any person — any Roman Catholic — who would think that there is any likelihood, any hope or chance, of its being disturbed now. The Roman Catholic rests, as the Protestant does, upon the general security of the law, and you need exact no oath from him in order to make the settlement of property safe. The oath then goes on to say—

> "And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment as settled by law within this realm; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in this kingdom."—[*Ibid.*]

Well, you say that the Protestant is not debarred from doing this, but that the Roman Catholic is; and by saying that you at once admit that there is no equality between the Protestant and the Catholic. I frankly own that in holding this language you offer an affront to the Roman Catholic, and likewise do that which is contrary to the spirit of the present time. The spirit of the present time, I venture to say, is that all Members of Parliament should have that equality to which Sir Robert Peel refers; every man who enters Parliament should have the power of voting according to his own conscience for those measures which he believes to be for the welfare of the kingdom. The noble Earl said he thought this was a question affecting the welfare of the kingdom. I agree with him in that, and I hold that it is for the welfare of the kingdom that every man who enters Parliament and declares, as we all do, his allegiance to the Crown should have full liberty to express his opinion, whether with regard to the Church Establishment or with regard to any part of the laws of his country. And if you attempt by any oath to restrain any man from exercising that liberty, you debar him from that equal and just freedom which every Member of either House of Parliament ought to have. I say, then, that this oath is contrary to the intention and views with which the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, and contrary also to the spirit of the present times. It may have been that in the year 1757 or 1797 there was a different spirit prevalent in respect to these things, but I hold that we are living in an age of progress in all these matters. My opinion is, that the more regardful men become of each other's opinions, the larger and more liberal will be their view of a question like the present. And what I find fault with the noble Earl for is, that while he submits to Roman Catholic emancipation, while he is ready to agree to all that was enacted in 1829, he can make no concession to the progress of religious liberty, and refuses that which the Roman Catholic fairly and justly asks at your hands. Then we come to the question of the ambiguity of the oath. The noble Earl says there is no ambiguity in it, or that any oath may be in a certain degree ambiguous. Now, I confess that it appears to me that, with regard to the oath of allegiance, there is no ambiguity about it; but with regard to this oath there is ambiguity. It has been disputed up to the present time among the Roman Catholics in what sense this oath ought to be understood. There are many who think it precludes a Roman Catholic who has taken it, as a Member of this or the other House of Parliament, from giving any vote which may tend to injure the revenues of the United Church of England and Ireland. There are many who act upon that principle. There are others who hold totally different opinions. One very learned person has, I believe, been quoted in the other House of Parliament as having given the true interpretation of this oath. I refer to Mr. Justice Shee, then Mr. Serjeant Shee. But what was said by another very learned and excellent man, Mr. Napier, with respect to Mr. Serjeant Shee's interpretation of the Catholic oath? Speaking in June 1859, Mr. Napier observed—

> "The hon. and learned Gentleman, when not a Member of that House, published a book irreconcilable with the plain construction of the oath."

Again, Mr. Napier said—

> "The proposition of Serjeant Shee in his speech was contrary to the oath to which he had himself alluded."

Yet Mr. Whiteside, speaking on May 17, this very Session, quoted Mr. Serjeant Shee's interpretation of the oath, and remarked—

"That is an exposition of the oath by one who is a Roman Catholic, and an ornament to the Bench, and I believe his interpretation is a correct one."

At the same time there are many conscientious Roman Catholics who say that, although this oath might be binding on them in case they held any civil appointment or office, yet in their capacity as legislators it is no more binding on them than the Coronation Oath was held to be on George IV., and that they are perfectly at liberty to give a vote for the entire subversion of the Church Establishment, so far as its revenues are concerned. I remember hearing the noble Earl himself on one occasion read out this oath in the presence of the Roman Catholic Members of the House of Commons, and then leave it to them to reconcile its obligations with the votes which many of them were about to give on a question affecting the revenues of the Established Church. And, my Lords, I must say I think that was a very painful state of things. You have these Catholic Members of the House of Commons, you have men as conscientious as any other part of the assembly to which they belong, and yet you say that Protestants are at perfect liberty to vote in support of the Established Church, or to vote for its total subversion, but that the Roman Catholic Members are guilty of perjury if they give a vote which may touch the revenues of that Church. I say that that is not a position of equality. It is not a position to which you ought to subject the Roman Catholics unless it be necessary for your security. But how is it necessary? Supposing the Roman Catholics were no more bound in this matter than the Protestants, what would be the consequence? There are many Roman Catholics who think that the Protestant Church is a security for good order, for property, for the general observance of piety; and these men would most willingly and far more cheerfully give a vote against any attempt to subvert it if an oath of this kind were no longer maintained. There would be others who would give a vote against the present revenues of the Church in Ireland. But does any one believe that the oath is a security for the Protestant Church in Ireland? As long as the Members of both Houses of Parliament believe that the Established Church is connected with religion in Ireland, with the Union between Ireland and this country, and with the general welfare of Ireland and the United Kingdom, so long the Protestant Church in Ireland will be supported; but if these securities fail—if men should cease to have an attachment to the Protestant Church in Ireland—should see that the maintenance of that Church was unnecessary for upholding the Union—should think that the good of Ireland and of the kingdom at large made it necessary that the revenues of that Church should be cut down—I do not think the flimsy protection of these two or three sentences in the oath would be any security. Why, then, not rely on that which would be a real security—namely, giving to Protestants and Catholics the same just liberty? Why not rely on the discretion and wisdom of Parliament for what is useful to that country, beneficial to religion, and essential to the maintenance of property, and not depend for security on those words which are put in to entrap Roman Catholics, and which, at least, only raise doubts as to their ability to give votes affecting the revenues of the Protestant Church in Ireland? The noble Earl said he was willing to give up those parts of the oath which pledge Roman Catholics against mental equivocation in the taking of the oath, and against the doctrine that it is lawful to murder an excommunicated Sovereign. I own I think there would be no advantage in taking away those parts of the oath; for by so doing you would disturb the settlement made in 1829; but you would not at the same time give satisfaction to the Roman Catholics, neither would you complete that which is necessary for religious liberty in this country. With regard to the objects of the Roman Catholics, if they wish to set up a Roman Catholic establishment in place of the Protestant, or if they should endeavour to injure the Protestant establishment with the view of advancing the Roman Catholic religion, I think you may rely on the Protestant feeling of this country to defeat any such attempt. Looking, then, at this measure as a step in the progress of religious liberty, as a necessary step tending to give a portion of our fellow-subjects the full freedom which they ought to enjoy, I shall vote most heartily for the second reading of the Bill.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, he was so pained at having to take any step which might seem hostile to his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and at variance with every antecedent of his former life, that he trusted the House would excuse him for a few minutes while he expressed his reasons for voting against this Bill. He could not consider this measure simply as a concession to civil and religious liberty; for he did believe that those words now proposed to be omitted had been put into the oath by Sir Robert Peel and accepted by the country, reluctant to see the Emancipation Act passed, as a specific security for the Irish Church. Whether it was necessary to introduce them at first was another question; but he believed Parliament could not now remove them without indirectly and by a side wind giving a very considerable impulse to the attempts to destroy the Irish Church. And for what purpose? Because the words did not give a perfect security, did they afford no security at all? Why do we not dismiss our police because they do not entirely prevent robberies and outrages? No single security was perfect; but a multiplication of them might afford a perfect security. The oath of allegiance did not protect the Sovereign from conspiracy; but would any one tell him that putting the oath of allegiance on the statute-book and into the mouth of every subject did not contribute very materially to the security of Her Majesty? Therefore, he thought it impossible to have this oath existing in an Act of Parliament without at the same time having a declaration on the statute-book that, at present, at all events, Parliament was not prepared to deal with the Church Establishment in Ireland. He agreed with what the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) had said as to the expressions in the oath which were really offensive to Roman Catholics; and, therefore, though unwilling to disturb the settlement of 1829, he would go as far as to remove them, on the ground that they constituted a grievance. Bnt was there a grievance in the declaration that they would not destroy the Protestant Church? This was the very thing which Sir Robert Peel wanted to prevent them from doing. In the offensive passages doctrines were imputed to them which they repudiated; but in the declaration relating to the Established Church no opinion was imputed to them which they did not hold. They did not recoil from the charge that it was their wish to destroy the Protestant Church in Ireland. Not at all. At their public meetings and in their organs they said, "We shall destroy the Established Church." The question, therefore, was, would their Lordships say, "You may," when the Roman Catholics said, "We shall?" If the Protestant Church in Ireland was to be destroyed, let it be by the votes of Protestants and not by those of Roman Catholics. Parliament ought to be very slow in touching settlements. No doubt, no Act of Parliament could bind for all time. The Act of Union with Scotland could not so bind; but Scotland would have felt very much aggrieved if, within thirty-five years after the passing of the Act of Union, Parliament had done anything to touch the conditions on which the Scotch people had assented to that Act. If a grievance could be shown, he would consent to touch the settlement; but there was no grievance.

EARL RUSSELL: It is a fetter. The Roman Catholics are told they commit perjury if they take a particular course of action in Parliament.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: No doubt it is a fetter—it was intended as a fetter; and if, because the fetter galled now Parliament consented to remove it, its doing so would be tantamount to a declaration that every security given at the passing of the Bill might be thrown to the winds as soon as the object of the moment had been achieved. Let the Protestant members of the Legislature discuss the position of the Church in Ireland without the aid of Roman Catholics, and if they should arrive at the conclusion that it ought to be abolished, then let them remove this oath; but let them not prejudge the question by first removing what was intended to be a protection to the Protestant Church. With these views he was sorry he must object to the second reading of the Bill, being of opinion that it was a step in a direction which he was not prepared to go, and not finding any statement of grievance sufficient to induce him to incur any risk.

EARL GREY: My Lords, I have heard the speech of my noble Friend who has just sat down with great regret, because I could not have believed he would vote against the second reading of this Bill; and the grounds on which he has based his opposition to the measure have, if possible, increased that regret. My noble Friend resists this Bill on the ground that its principles and tendency are to remove what he thinks is a security for the maintenance of the Established Church in Ireland. Now, my Lords, I am prepared to argue that the continuance of the oath now imposed on Roman Catholics when they take their seats in either House of Parliament, far from being useful to the maintenance of the Established Church in that country, is injurious to the cause. In the first place, allow me to remark that at most the only effect which the oath can have is to prevent Roman Catholic Members of either House from voting on measures affecting the Established Church. But it may be doubted whether the oath was originally intended to have this effect, and experience proves that it has not been so understood. Only a few years after this oath was imposed the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) brought in a Bill in the House of Commons, sweeping away altogether the right of vestry cess in Ireland, and making considerable reductions in the property of the Established Church. No doubt the noble Earl's motive was thereby to give greater security to the Establishment in Ireland; but, for this purpose, it made a considerable sacrifice of the property to which the Church was then entitled. Yet it never entered into the noble Earl's head that Catholic Members were debarred by their oath from voting for that Bill. A few years after that a clause was proposed in the Irish Tithe Bill, which was known as the Appropriation Clause; and, upon the same principle that the Roman Catholic Members had been considered entitled to support the noble Earl's Bill, they were regarded as having a right to support that clause also. Although there might be some few exceptions, as a body they certainly considered themselves entitled to do so. Looking at the principle on which both these Bills were founded, I do not see how the noble Earl can suppose that Catholic Members who voted for them might not, in like manner, vote for any measure which may hereafter be proposed for carrying the same principle farther, and altering the existing arrangement of Church property in Ireland by transferring a portion of it to the Roman Catholics. And I think the oath admits of a construction which is plausible, at all events, and which would fully justify such a vote. It may be argued that the oath as it stands was intended to bind those who take their seats in either House of Parliament to abstain from any attempt to subvert the Church Establishment while it is established by law; not to fetter the discretion of Members of the Legislature as to supporting such measures for the alteration of the law as may be brought before them. In favour of this construction it may be urged that no Legislature has a right to bind succeeding Legislatures—so that the Parliament of 1829 had no right to bind the Parliament of 1865, and the oath it imposed ought to be understood in a sense consistent with this principle. Some of your Lordships may, perhaps, remember that the question of the right of one generation to bind their successors by oaths imposed on those to whom the supreme power of legislation is intrusted was argued in this House by one whose name I have the honour to bear, and whom I very unworthily succeed in this question—when he argued, with regard to the Coronation oath, with great success, as it seemed to me, that it could not be held to bind the Crown against giving its assent to any Act which the wisdom of Parliament might think necessary for the welfare of the people. So it appears to me that every Member of the Legislature is under a higher and prior obligation to give his vote according to his conscience for the good of the country, and no oath imposed by the authority of a previous Parliament can fetter him in the exercise of his judgment and discretion. If it be shown that the oath does fetter him and deprive him of that discretion, so much the more reason is there for relieving him, because it is not right or consistent with the principles of our Constitution that we should endeavour to prevent those who sit in either House of Parliament from freely discharging their duties by voting according to their consciences. For these reasons I believe that the oath fairly admits of a construction that would allow Roman Catholic Members to vote for such a Bill as it is anticipated may some day come before them; and certainly the experience we have had with regard to former measures, should lead us to expect that it will be generally so understood. Suppose, however, it were admitted that the oath is as stringent as can be wished, and that it will effectually prevent Roman Catholic Members from voting for measures in respect of the Irish Church which they in their judgment believed to be right, I would ask your Lordships what you would gain by maintaining it? It is clear that no Bill for altering the existing law with respect to the Church Establishment in Ireland can be passed until there shall be such a change of opinion on this subject in England and Scotland that the British Parliament is prepared to pass a Bill for that purpose. But if the opinion of England and Scotland should undergo such a change, this oath would be so flimsy an obstacle to the passing of a Bill for giving effect to the wishes of the nation that it would be at once swept away. If public opinion were satisfied that such an alteration, with respect to the Church Establishment of Ireland, ought to take place, Parliament would have no difficulty whatever in sweeping away the oath as a preliminary measure. This security, therefore, which you value so highly is utterly imaginary. It protects you so long as there is no danger; but the moment danger becomes serious, and there is a prospect of Parliament passing a Bill of this nature, your security is morally certain to be swept away. But that is not all. The most probable cause of such a change of opinion in the public mind I believe would be the aggravation of the animosity and hostility of the Irish people to the Established Church to such a degree that the people of this country would come to the conclusion that such a change was necessary to meet the increased difficulty in governing Ireland. That, I believe, would be the most probable cause of such a change. What do you gain, then, by retaining your security at the expense of increasing a state of feeling which must infallibly cause the loss of that security? What other effect can result from the rejection of this Bill? The Roman Catholic Members of both Houses feel, and justly feel, that to require this oath from them is an insult and a degradation; and you tell them "we will compel you to submit to that degradation for the safety and security of the Established Church." Could you contrive, by the utmost stretch of ingenuity, any course of action more calculated to inflame and embitter the hostility of the Irish people to the Establishment which you wish to protect, and thus to increase the real danger to which that Establishment is exposed? I object to the Amendment, because I am convinced it tends to embitter the feelings of both parties in Ireland, and to accelerate the struggle which, sooner or later, will come if Parliament is determined to maintain the existing arrangements with regard to Church property in Ireland. In arguing this question, I do not shrink from declaring that I adhere to the opinion I have ever expressed during nearly forty years that I have taken part in public life, and which has only been strengthened by experience and reflection, that the existing arrangement with reference to the distribution of Church property in Ireland is so essentially unjust, and so contrary to natural equity, that, if you are determined to maintain it, sooner or later a struggle for its removal must come. But it is not desirable to accelerate that struggle or make it more bitter, as I am persuaded you will do, by rejecting this Bill. Upon an occasion like this I am not about to enter into so large and so difficult a question as the Irish Church; but I must remind your Lordships that all the most distinguished advocates of a Church Establishment, as a national institution, have one and all rested their defence of it on its usefulness. Only the other evening the Bishop of Oxford, in advocating an extension of the episcopate, in an eloquent speech, said the episcopal order existed for the benefit of the great mass of the people. That principle has also been forcibly laid down by every writer on the subject. But in Ireland alone, of all countries in the world, you have a Church professing to be a national Church, which is of no use to the great majority of the people, and the whole endowment of which goes to support a clergy whose instruction is only accepted by a small minority of the people, and that mainly the richest, while the largest and poorest part of the population is left, unassisted by public funds, to maintain its own clergy. The Irish people cannot forget that three centuries ago the property which now constitutes the endowment of the Church Establishment in that country was property belonging to the Roman Catholic Church; that the Irish people have not changed their religion, but that the English people have, and by the superior power of this country, and by means of an Irish Parliament, in which the people of Ireland had no real representation, the property so long held by the Roman Catholic Church has been transferred to the Protestant Church; and that from that time to this we have seen the extraordinary anomaly of the property of that Church devoted to the support of the clergy of a small minority. I say that is a state of things which must shock the natural sense of justice of any dispassionate man, and I am persuaded that it is the sense of wrong which that state of things has produced which lies at the root of all the difficulties we have experienced in the Government of Ireland, and why we have never succeeded in raising the people of that country from the unfortunate position which they occupy. I am persuaded that that difficulty will never cease until Parliament is prepared to undertake the settlement of this question. In saying this, let me not be misunderstood as advocating the subversion of the Church Establishment of Ireland and the application of its whole property to other purposes. The passions that would be excited, and the difficulty there would be in carrying it, would render such a measure most inexpedient, even if it could be accomplished. I believe that any violent measure of this sort would inflict a grievous blow to the welfare of Ireland, and would be most injurious to both Churches. But if this question be regarded in a spirit of justice, wisdom, and, above all, of Christian charity, I believe it would not be impossible to discover a mode of settling the question in a manner that would be just to all parties and advantageous for the interests of the Protestant religion. I cannot forbear saying that one reason why I deplore the present state of things is the injurious effect it has upon the spread of the Protestant religion—I mean the real living power of the Protestant religion—over the minds of the people. Entertaining, as I do, a strong conviction of the truth and purity of our faith, I can scarcely understand how it is that during so many years and with such great advantages it has made such little progress in the affections of the people of Ireland; I can only attribute it to one cause—the sense of injustice kept alive in the minds of the Roman Catholics by the maintenance of the present arrangements, and, above all, to the effect produced, by their seeing that while we are professing to teach them the highest precepts of Christianity, we are pursuing towards them a course of conduct which is inconsistent with one of the first of these precepts—those feelings have prevented the success of all efforts to extend the Protestant religion in Ireland. Therefore, I say that, in the interests of our religion, I am anxious to see some more equitable arrangement adopted. I have said that I believe it would not be impossible to discover a mode which might be adopted fairer to all parties. My great objection to the Amendment is that it seems to be calculated to make any such settlement impossible, but is rather calculated to embitter the feelings on both sides and to render both parties more unwilling to acquiesce in any reasonable arrangement or compromise, and that it will stimulate our Roman Catholic fellow subjects, who, for many years past, had been willing to allow this question of an Establishment to fall comparatively into abeyance, and dispose them to commence their assaults on that Establishment, and be satisfied with nothing but the utter subversion, instead of seeking to effect its reformation and re-arrangement. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) has read to us many speeches and declarations of Roman Catholic prelates and others before 1829, showing that at that time there was little disposition to attack the Establishment. Those declarations were, I am sure, quite sincere; but the consequences of the controversies which raged after they were made have been to bring about an altered state of feeling, and we are now reaping the consequences of the errors then committed. When the Union was brought about we know that it was the desire of Mr. Pitt that that measure should have been accompanied by one to relieve Roman Catholics from civil disabilities, and another for making some public provision for the clergy of that faith. That wise policy was defeated upon the same plea as is now put forward—danger to the Established Church. What has been the consequence? Is there a man of ordinary intelligence in this country who is not convinced that if Mr. Pitt's views had been adopted at the end of the last century the Protestant Establishment in Ireland would have stood at this time in a position of far less insecurity than that which it now occupies? Just forty years ago this House was induced to reject the Bill for Catholic Relief, which had passed the other House, upon the same plea of danger to the Church Establishment. Affairs, however, were changed between 1825 and 1829, and in the latter year Catholic emancipation was carried. In 1829, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) who moved the Amendment has himself told us, after having refused Catholic Emancipation when tendered on the grounds of fairness and justice, when it would have been accepted with gratitude as a graceful and voluntary concession, it was brought forward by its old opponents and justified upon the ground that however great might be the dangers of concession, the dangers of further resistance would be still greater. It was passed under compulsion, and after what I may call an insurrection of the 40*s.* freeholders in Ireland against the attempt to make them return Members hostile to Catholic Emancipation. Shall we, then, after that experience, and after that lesson, repeat the same mistake, and will you now for the sake of maintaining a security for the Church, which I have shown to be utterly imaginary and certain to fail when the time of need shall come — will you, for the sake of maintaining for perhaps four or five years longer—which is the longest period which those who are accustomed to read the signs of the times will give for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic oath—will you for that add a new cause of irritation and hatred against the Establishment in the minds of your Roman

Catholic fellow-subjects. That is the question we have now to decide, and therefore, while I have not disguised, and never will disguise, any opinion I conscientiously entertain, I say that those who wish to prevent the subversion of the Church Establishment in Ireland will do unwisely in voting against the second reading of this Bill.

LORD ST. LEONARDS would have been content to have left the debate to the eloquent and argumentative speech of his noble Friend who moved the Amendment, but he desired to bring the discussion back to the real question before the House. It was not whether we should now impose on the Roman Catholics the conditions of which they complain, but whether those conditions should now be repealed. We should first inquire what were the circumstances under which those restrictions were put upon the great benefits conferred in 1829 on the Roman Catholics. The Catholic Association was then in existence — an illegal institution and utterly inconsistent with all settled government. The first condition of the boons to be granted was the suppression of that association, and accordingly the very first Act passed in the Session was to effect that object. Then it was necessary to alter materially the elective franchise which also was accomplished, these were great and important measures, without which the proposed relief could not be granted. Still it was deemed necessary to obtain from the Roman Catholics themselves some assurance that their new privileges should not be used to the detriment of the State. It is now urged that the conditions attached to the grant were unjust ones. It is true that they were not a strong security against abuse, but he (Lord St. Leonards) was a party in the other House to the passing of the measure, and he could assure their Lordships that no ministry could have passed any such measure of relief without some satisfactory guards to preserve our civil and ecclesiastical institutions. It was, indeed, as we all know, with great difficulty that the measure with the conditions could be passed. Without them, the relief would not have been granted. The relief was extensive and the conditions which are now sought to be repealed are such as no man need object to perform. They consist of an oath that the party will defend to the utmost of his power the settlement of property within this realm which relates to the settlement of property in Ireland in the time of Charles II. It might not be necessary now to enact such a provision, but to repeal it now would be to place in the power of those who mean mischief the means of persuading the lower orders in Ireland that the claims against the present owners of property in Ireland on the part of the Roman Catholic Church and the descendants of proprietors long since deceased were intended by Parliament to be recognized. Then the person taking the oath has to disclaim and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment as settled by law in this realm, and that he never will exercise any privilege to which he is or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the united Government. These surely were not hard conditions to annex to the ample grants. It is said that the same oaths are not imposed on Protestants. Certainly not, but the state of things at the time fully justified the distinction. Sir Robert Peel had other conditions proposed to him, for example the veto which he might have imposed, but he wisely rejected it. It was proposed that he should restrain the Roman Catholic from voting in Parliament on ecclesiastical matters; but he objected to this as really placing the Roman Catholic and the Protestant in Parliament upon a different footing. It was clearly understood that the Roman Catholics might vote on ecclesiastical matters in Parliament. There were other conditions imposed which every one would now willingly get rid of, but that it is agreed that it would be unwise to disturb the settlement of 1829 by their repeal without going further so as to satisfy the Roman Catholics. England is prepared to grant to them every privilege which is consistent with the safety of the Protestant Establishment. Mr. Canning, he believed it was, who stated that the only defence for the penal laws, now happily repealed, was that they answered the purpose for which they were passed. He could not but regard the measure before the House as tending to destroy the settlement of 1829, a settlement which during thirty-six years had, he felt certain, produced exceedingly good fruits. That settlement had worked very satisfactorily, but if they destroyed one important portion of it —the conditions imposed—might not an attempt be made to sweep away the grant to which they were attached. Surely no one could accept the grant and reject the conditions. In his opposition to the Bill he did not believe that any one could accuse him of being actuated by bigotry, he had concurred in the settlement of 1829, and whilst some six years in Ireland, and exercising the patronage of his office, he never asked what was the religion of the applicant, but looked only at character and capacity. Things had gone on smoothly, and it was a pity that such a question of discord should have been brought in at the present time. It might possibly be urged, in favour of the measure, that no difficulty had arisen during the thirty-six years that the settlement had been in existence, but he believed that the difficulty had, in all probability, been obviated by the settlement itself. If the settlement of 1829 was not a contract it was at all events a grant of a great privilege upon certain conditions and accepted upon those conditions. Could any man, therefore, come forward now after thirty-six years and say that it was a mistake to accept the grant on those conditions? A noble Lord opposite had said, "Oh, but since that time we have made great progress." Well, he hoped that progress would stop short of pulling down part of the structure of 1829. He would remind the House that there were other guards contained in the Act of 1829. Roman Catholic Archbishops, Bishops, and Deans had been forbidden to usurp the rights belonging to the dignitaries of the Protestant Church. But the law had been evaded and set at nought. Roman Catholic Bishops, instead of taking the title of the Protestant Archbishops and Bishops, assumed titles from other places; but when England was parcelled out by the Pope of Rome into divisions in defiance of Acts of Parliament, the blood of England was roused, and such a universal agitation excited in the country as he never remembered to have witnessed before. The evasion by the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of the provision in the Act of 1829 against their assuming the titles of the Protestant Archbishops and Bishops, led to the enactment in the 14 & 15 *Vict.* c. 60, which recited the settlement of 1829, and that it might be doubted whether the former Act extended to the assumption of the title of an Archbishop, &c., of a pretended province, &c., not being the See of any Archbishop, &c. recognized by law, but the attempt to establish such pretended Sees, &c., under colour of authority from the See of Rome or otherwise was declared to be illegal and void. The Act then makes such assumption liable for every offence to a penalty of £100. This Act which forbade the assumption of those titles had no ambiguity in it, as this oath was said to have. There never was an Act of Parliament framed with greater care; but, in spite of all that, we had Roman Catholic Bishops, including an Archbishop in the metropolis, with territorial titles, and yet there was not a single instance of an attempt to recover any of the penalties imposed by the Act. He was not prepared to give up all the securities which were deemed necessary at the settlement of 1829, and to allow the Roman Catholics to do just as they liked. Now, the Bill before the House was very singularly framed. The oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration were oaths which the Protestant took in common with the Roman Catholic. In the oath imposed by the Act of 1829, instead of saying that the Pope had no jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical or spiritual, which the Protestants swore and swore truly, these words, out of respect to the feelings of Roman Catholics, were omitted. An Act of Parliament was passed a few years ago not to alter the oaths taken by the Protestants, but to reduce them to one, and that one contained the very words abjuring the Pope's jurisdiction in ecclesiastical or spiritual matters. But what did this Bill propose to do? It professed to consolidate the three oaths into one, in imitation of the Act of Parliament to which he had just referred, but of course leaving out the denial of the Pope's ecclesiastical and spiritual power in this realm. And there it stops, so that without venturing openly and directly to repeal the provisions and guard in the settlement of 1829, it indirectly repeals, by omitting them. There would therefore be no declaration to preserve the settlement of property, to protect the present Church Establishment, or to prevent the exercise of the privileges secured to the Roman Catholics by the Act of 1829, so as to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, or Protestant government in the United Kingdom. And yet there could not be more proper declarations to impose upon Roman Catholics. The present time, when, as their Lordships knew, the utmost efforts were being made to promote the spread of monastic institutions in this country, which were expressly struck at by the Act of 1829, was not a moment to weaken any of the securities which the Bill of 1829 afforded, and for these reasons he should vote against the second reading of the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF **CLANRICARDE** said, he thought that nothing could be more idle than the attempt to support any institution by mere tests and subscriptions. It was a matter of astonishment to him how long the Established Church in Ireland had contrived to survive the damaging advocacy of those who professed to be its most zealous followers. Every liberal measure which had been passed during the last forty years had been opposed in its name; it was avowedly for its sake that so protracted a resistance had been offered to the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, and against the proposals for the national system of education; and it was from a similar consideration that the friends of that Church would have rejected the measure brought forward by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) for the reduction of the number of its bishops and a somewhat different distribution of its revenues, which had turned out to be so beneficial to its interests. That Church, he would admit, was an anomalous institution placed in peculiar circumstances, and matters connected with it required, no doubt, to be dealt with with the utmost deliberation; but he, for one, altogether denied that its existence or prosperity depended upon the retention of the words in the present Roman Catholic oath having reference to the settlement of property. He must, at the same time, observe, having had an opportunity of witnessing in Ireland the working both of an Established Church and of voluntary bodies, that he looked upon the maintenance of Establishments as of the utmost consequence. He regarded it, he might add, as a misfortune that the idea first broached by Mr. Pitt, and reverted to and proposed to Parliament in 1826, of paying the Roman Catholic clergy out of the revenues of the State had been rejected. He thought that rejection one of the most unfortunate events which had occurred for the last century in the political history of this country. As regarded those portions of the present Roman Catholic oath which related to the renunciation of the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope might be deposed and murdered by their subjects, and by which all those who took the oath were asked to swear that they made that renunciation without any equivocation or mental reservation, he could only say that he looked upon them as an insult to those of whom such declarations were required, and as perfectly useless in the shape of a security. The temper of the times and the position of the Roman Catholics since those declarations were first imposed, had undergone a great alteration; and even if that had not been the case, it would still be of no avail as a security for the Irish Church Establishment to maintain a form of oath which had no effect in preventing members of the Roman Catholic or any other religious persuasion from associating together to bring about its overthrow; while many Roman Catholic Members of Parliament looked upon the oath as degrading and offensive. No one would propose, at the present day, to exclude men from Parliament merely because, like the members of the Liberation Society, they published their determination to effect the total separation of the Church from the State. Under these circumstances their Lordships would, he thought, act most wisely in passing the present measure. The admission of Jews into Parliament had been regretted by nobody except the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Chelmsford), and he trusted that their Lordships would not follow the course they had adopted towards that measure of liberality, but would read this Bill a second time.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, that he felt no great desire to enter upon a discussion of this question, because it was impossible to argue it completely without offending the feelings of men for whom he entertained the highest respect, and whose faith he was desirous of treating with the forbearance and moderation which had been observed during the whole of this discussion. He must agree with the noble Earl behind him (the Earl of Derby) in regretting that this question should have been brought forward upon the eve of a general election, when the whole country would be agitated with political contests with which it was most undesirable that any subject should be mingled which was calculated to stir up religious animosity. If the question was to have been submitted to the consideration of Parliament at this or any other time, it should have been brought forward upon the open and avowed responsibility of the Government. It was no doubt to a certain extent true that the Government had no control over the action of independent Members of Parliament; but the author of this measure was a warm supporter of the Ministry, and there could be no doubt that he would gladly have secured to his cause the advantage of the weight and authority of the Government, by committing the question to their care. At all events, when the Bill came into that House it would have been more becoming in the Government to have taken its management into their own hands than to have ranged themselves behind any leader, even though he was one who was so well entitled to respect and esteem as was his noble Friend (the Earl of Devon) who had moved the second reading of this Bill. His noble Friend said that there was very little difference between the oath proposed in this Bill and that contained in the Act of 1858; but, as his noble Friend behind him had already pointed out in the oath of 1858, there was a declaration of supremacy which was wanting in that which was now before the House. He recurred to this subject because, speaking in another place, the Home Secretary said that if this Bill was passed the oaths taken by Roman Catholics and Protestants would be so similar that he could not conceive it possible but that we should soon have an uniform oath; and he (Lord Chelmsford) regretted to find that some hon. Friends of his had been caught by the idea of one uniform oath. He was quite sure that they had not reflected upon what must be the result of having one uniform oath. It was impossible that a Roman Catholic should take an oath in which the supremacy was at all recognized, and, therefore, any oath which was to be taken by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike must not contain even an indirect recognition of the supremacy. There were some members of the Established Church who were strongly opposed to the idea of the supremacy, and he should be very averse to taking the bridle off their necks by allowing them to take an oath similar to that taken by Roman Catholics. In the year 1854, when the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) introduced one of his Bills for the admission of Jews to Parliament, he proposed a form of oath which contained no recognition of the supremacy. He (Lord Chelmsford) divided the House of Commons against the Bill upon that ground, and defeated the measure. The question now before their Lordships, however, was not with regard to one uniform oath, but whether they were prepared to abolish a most vital and essential part of the oath which was contained in the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829, and to substitute for it the oath proposed by this Bill. He did not desire to strain the compact of 1829 beyond its fair limits—he did not contend that the oath adopted in 1829 was in every part unalterable; but he did maintain that there were parts of it which were vital and essential, and which were and ought to be of permanent obligation. He did not mean to say that it was not in the power of Parliament to change that oath or even to abolish it altogether; but as it had been accepted as the condition upon which the Roman Catholics had been admitted to Parliament, he did say that, although Parliament might have the power to change it, it would not be right for them to do so lightly. He begged their Lordships to recall the circumstances under which that oath was framed. At the commencement of the Session in which the Roman Catholic Relief Act was passed, His Majesty, in the Speech from the Throne, recommended that Parliament should—

> "Review the laws which impose civil disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, and consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and perfect security of our establishments in Church and State, and with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge."—[2 *Hansard*, xx. 4.]

Therefore, the oath being one of the securities which were considered necessary, it was framed with a special view to the protection which was suggested in the Speech from the Throne. That oath, as had already been stated by his noble Friend (the Earl of Derby), was agreed to by the Roman Catholic Prelates of that day — and its terms were taken from the oath contained in the Act of 1793. The oath of 1793 contained those parts of the oath which pledged the person taking it to abstain from doing anything to weaken or injure the Establishment and to respect the settlement of property, and it contained other clauses to which he was surprised that any Roman Catholic could have submitted. When the oath was framed which was established by the Roman Catholic Relief Act, the parts which were now objected to were not contrived for the purpose of flattering the Roman Catholics, but were simply a portion of the oath which Protestants had taken for a great number of years. It seemed to be assumed that those parts of the oath which were said to be offensive to Roman Catholics were contrived especially for them. But Protestants as well as Roman Catholics had been required to take the oath in that form, and Roman Catholics took it then without any idea of offence at being required to renounce sentiments which were no doubt odious in themselves, and which must be repugnant to everybody. The objections to these parts of the oath grew up rather late in the day; because from 1829 down to the present year, he was not aware that any Roman Catholic had objected to them as insulting. Down to 1854 no one ever dreamed of altering the oath. In 1849 the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), in one of his many Bills for the admission of the Jews to Parliament, said he did not think it expedient to alter the Roman Catholic oath which was settled in 1829. "Many hon. Gentlemen" (said the noble Earl), "thought the oath did give security to the Protestant Church, and therefore he saw no sufficient cause for proposing an alteration of it." On that occasion Sir Robert Peel said, in his opinion, the noble Earl had acted wisely in not disturbing the Roman Catholic oath. In 1852, in one of the Reform Bills brought forward by the noble Earl, there was a new oath framed; but the Roman Catholic oath was not altered, except by leaving out the word "murdered" after the word "deposed" because the noble Earl thought that was insulting to the Roman Catholics; but he did not seem to think at that time that the remainder of the oath could be regarded as any insult to them. Then, in 1854, when the noble Earl introduced a general form of oath, he said that the Roman Catholics had never applied for any alteration of the oath; that he had not consulted them, and was not at all aware that they required any change. Thus, from 1829 down at least to 1854, there seemed to have been no objection to this oath on the part of Roman Catholics, and no idea of insult from taking it. He (Lord Chelmsford) admitted that, inasmuch as during the whole of this time Protestants were required to take the same oath, Roman Catholics might feel that no improper or invidious distinction was made. But in 1858 a new oath was introduced for Protestants—a general oath, instead of the oaths of allegiance, of supremacy, and abjuration; and from that oath there was eliminated all that portion respecting the deposition and murder of excommunicated princes, and the declaration that the oath was taken without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation. After 1858, then, he admitted that the Catholics might say, "You have now put us on a different footing from that on which our Protestant fellow-subjects stand; a distinction is now made between us which is insulting to our feelings;" and they might very properly have asked for a remission of these portions of the oath.

Lord Chelmsford

Until the present year they did not ask for any such change; but if they had now asked for it and nothing more, he would freely have made the concession, and would have abolished this invidious distinction. But the other part of the oath deserved much more serious consideration; and he thought it would be dangerous to abandon the part of it which formed the principal condition upon which the Roman Catholic was admitted to Parliament in 1829. It was proposed to omit that part of the oath in which the Roman Catholic undertook to defend to the utmost of his power the settlement of property as established by law, and in which he disclaimed any intention to subvert the Church Establishment. Their Lordships would observe that Roman Catholics did not allege that this was any matter of offence. What they said was, "We find this a restraint upon our free action, and we desire to have it removed." The fair answer was, "Why that is the very thing that was intended; that is precisely what we meant and what you agreed to accept. You agreed to have your hands tied in this way as a condition of obtaining a seat in Parliament." In fact, as his noble Friend had stated, the Roman Catholics tied their own hands; the oath was prepared by the Roman Catholic Prelates, and it was perfectly clear that if they had not agreed to accept it on those terms Roman Catholics would never have been received into the Legislature. This oath was intended as a security. Now, had it proved one? Their Lordships had heard that there were scrupulous Roman Catholics who abstained from interfering in any question connected with the Church, on the ground that they were restrained from doing so by the oath they had taken. Another complaint alleged against the oath was that it was ambiguous, that Roman Catholics hardly knew how they were to act upon any particular occasion; that some felt the oath to be binding, while others thought that it had no restrictive force. Now, in the first place, no one ever expected that unscrupulous persons would be bound by any oath; but it was desirable to restrain scrupulous Roman Catholics from any assault upon the Establishment. As to its ambiguity, it was obvious that every man must construe it according to his conscience; but if any one entertained the slightest doubt whether he ought or ought not to vote upon a particular occasion, it was prudent for him to follow the wholesome rule of practical morality, that if you have a doubt about the propriety of doing a thing, you had better refrain from doing it. The oath had been a security, and this was proved by the very fact that Roman Catholics found it a restraint and wished to have it removed. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), with whose progress on this and other questions their Lordships were pretty familiar, seemed to think in 1854 that all these restraints were improper, for he said—

> "You should, by the terms of your oath, leave every man to vote upon one political question as he would upon another. He ought to be free to vote upon questions of every kind, be it Church Rates, or be it any other question with regard to the Church Establishment. Whatever his opinion may be, he ought to be able to give effect to that opinion, as much as he could upon a question with respect to the Malt Tax or to Exchequer Bonds." [3 *Hansard*, cxxxiii. 955.]

These were the noble Earl's sentiments in 1854; very different from those of 1849. That was not surprising. But the noble Earl did not advert to the stringent condition which the Roman Catholics had taken upon themselves, and which would be violated by their admission to the freedom of which he spoke. He (Lord Chelmsford) maintained that the oath was a security; and was this a time in which they ought to abandon any securities which were provided for the Established Church? Was there no disposition shown on the part of Roman Catholics to assail the Establishment? With regard to the Irish Church, it was admitted that the Roman Catholics desired to aim a deadly blow at that portion of the Establishment. And with regard to the abandonment of securities, he might be allowed to read a letter written by the Secretary of the National Association not very long ago, at a time when the Prince of Wales was in Ireland—

> "Sir,—The *Irish Times* of this day contains an announcement that the Established Church has been withdrawn from the programme of the National Association; and the questions to which it will confine its attention will be tenant-right and education. I beg to inform you that there is no foundation for the above statement, and the intentions of the association in relation to the Irish Church Establishment have undergone no modification; and that the gentlemen with whom rests the direction of the policy of the association are unanimous in the determination to have no compromise with the Establishment or its advocates, and to spare no effort for its overthrow."

Now, strictly speaking, though reference was made to the Irish Church, there was no Irish Church in contradistinction to the Church of England. The two Churches were united by the Act of Union as one Church, and those who thought that any measure that affected the Irish Church could have no bearing on the interests of the Church of England were much mistaken. The oath should therefore not be made merely to meet the wishes of the Irish Roman Catholics, but should be framed with a due regard to the requirements of the English, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. It was said that these were merely the sentiments of the Irish Roman Catholics, and he was asked why he should mistrust the English Roman Catholics? He had a very great esteem for the English Roman Catholics, as they invariably expressed their sentiments upon the question of the Church Establishment and the Constitution in a straightforward and manly way; but they were necessarily exposed to the danger of external influence, and it might be that obedience to that external influence might lead them to attack a Church which, if left to their own free will, they might be disinclined to touch. The noble and learned Lord who had just addressed their Lordships had adverted to the appointment to the prelacy in England of a Roman Catholic of great influence and authority, who had formerly been a clergyman in the Church of England (Dr. Manning). The theories propounded by that prelate in his lectures upon the subject of the religious subjugation of England were rather startling. He said—

> "If ever there was a land in which work is to be done, and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much if I say that we have to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and rule, an Imperial race; we have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world as the will of old Rome reigned once. We have to bend or break that will which nations and kingdoms have found invincible and inflexible. We have to gather for this work the rough stones of this great people and to perfect them as gems for the sanctuary of God. It is good for us to be here, because a nobler field could not be chosen than England on which to fight the battle of the Church. What Constantinople, and Ephesus, and Africa were to the heresies of old, England is to the last complex and manifold heresy of modern times. Were it conquered in England it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here, and therefore in England the Church of God must be gathered in its strength."

He read that extract for the purpose of showing that this was not the time when we should abandon any of the securities we had obtained for the Established Church. He should be glad to give up everything which was offensive to the Catholics, provided that in doing so no safeguard of the Church was abandoned. It was upon the guarantee for the safety of the Established Church contained in the oath it was now proposed to alter that the Roman Catholics obtained that which, without that guarantee, they never would have obtained—namely, the right to sit in Parliament, and it appeared to him that as their right to sit in Parliament was permanent, so the conditions upon which they obtained that right should be permanent also, and, so far as he was concerned, he would never willingly abandon one of those conditions which he regarded as essential.

LORD LYVEDEN said, it had been stated on the other side of the House that this measure had been brought forward as a piece of election "clap trap," and that if the measure was seriously intended to be carried, the Government would have lent it all the weight of their support and authority. He, however, did not think the Ministers would have done rightly in bringing the matter forward as a Government measure, and they would have been acting most unjustifiably had they taken the matter up after the principle of the Bill had been adopted by the House of Commons by such large majorities; and he thought, therefore, the Bill came before their Lordships with much more grace in the hands of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Devon) who had for so many years given his attention to the subject, than it would have done had the Government tried to force the Bill through the House. It had been said that the eve of a general election was not the proper time for bringing forward such a scheme; but he thought no better time could be selected, as, depend upon it, every Member of the House of Commons was endeavouring, as far as possible, to study the views of his constituents; and, therefore, if they wished to obtain the opinion of the people of England on the question, they could not have a better opportunity for doing so than at the period of an expiring Parliament. It must be recollected that no such oath as the one it was proposed to alter was tendered either to the Dissenters or to the Jews. On the question of admitting the latter into Parliament he had some years ago himself proposed to do away with the Roman Catholic oath, but he was then opposed by the noble Earl (Earl Russell) below him. The Roman Catholics, however, also objected generously to his proposal on the ground that it might weaken the cause of the Jews, who were eventually admitted by a shabby subterfuge, but reserved to themselves the right of endeavouring to free themselves from the mark of inferiority contained in the oath whenever a fitting opportunity should arise. They now came forward and demanded to be freed from the necessity of taking the objectionable parts of the oath, and they were to be told that in consequence of something somebody had done thirty-five years ago they were not to be relieved. But he contended that nothing was done thirty-five years ago which would preclude Parliament from granting the reasonable request of the Catholics. Sir Robert Peel in 1829 said distinctly that the Roman Catholics had not been consulted, because it was better that the Legislature should be independent in considering the question before them. Therefore, there was no pledge given on the part of the Catholics, and the oath formed no part of a compact entered into between them and the Parliament. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) said there was no real grievance to the Roman Catholics in this oath; but, at any rate, they were the best judges, and if they regarded it as a grievance, that was a sufficient answer to the noble Earl. Look, also, at their behaviour since their admission to Parliament. The late Sir Robert Peel declared on one occasion that he had never known a Roman Catholic Member who had not voted from conscientious motives. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Chelmsford) had contended that the present was not the time for bringing forward this proposition, because serious attacks were being made on the Church of England; but did the noble and learned Lord think that ever in his lifetime the Church had been safer than at present, resting, as it did, upon the affections of the people? And why was the noble and learned Lord so fearful only of the Roman Catholics? Did he not think that the Dissenters were infinitely more hostile to the Church of England? Seeing the array of Peers on the Benches opposite, he regretted that there was no chance of the Bill being carried. He certainly thought that the noble Earl opposite would have done well to have allowed the House to go into Committee upon the Bill, and not to have called upon the House summarily and insultingly to reject a measure proposed for the relief of the consciences of their Roman Catholic fellow subjects. He deeply regretted to think that the Bill would be thrown out, but he hoped that a large number of Peers would support it, and show by their votes that they were not forgetful of the principles of religious liberty they acted on in past times.

The Marquess of **WESTMEATH** referred to the oath which the Roman Catholic prelates were obliged to take to the Pope, and observed that as that was not deemed offensive, he could not understand why Roman Catholic Members of Parliament should be so squeamish about the oath they were called on to take. He reminded the noble Lord who spoke of the large majority by which the Bill was carried in the House of Commons that the majority in its favour was only 19.

Viscount **STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE** said, that he had not come down to the House with the intention of taking part in the debate, but having listened to the discussion he thought it right to explain the vote he intended to give, because he entirely differed from the noble Lord on the Treasury bench. When he considered the manner in which this question had been brought forward, the want of time for its due consideration, the character of the Bill itself, and the circumstances generally attaching to it, he could not conscientiously give his vote in its support. The inclination of his mind was rather not to vote at all, and he could not say that he had heard any argument calculated to remove the impression he entertained against the measure; but being in the House he could not conscientiously refrain from recording his opinion. The same arguments which had been employed against the property of the Church in Ireland were equally applicable to the property of the Church in England.

On Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided*:— Contents 63; Not-Contents 84: Majority 21. *Resolved* in the *Negative*; and Bill to be read 2ª on *this Day Three Months.*

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L.Chan.*)

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Saint Albans, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Westminster, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Caithness, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Devon, E. [*Teller.*]
Ducie, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Minto, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Spencer, E.

Falmouth, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Torrington, V.

Abercromby, L.
Annaly, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Camoys, L.
Carew, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dartrey, L. (*L. Cremorne.*)
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Houghton, L.
Hunsdon, L. (*V. Falkland.*)
Lovat, L.
Lurgan, L.
Lyveden, L.
Methuen, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mostyn, L.
Panmure, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Petre, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stafford, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stourton, L.
Suffield, L.
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Taunton, L.
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Dublin, Archp.

Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Ailsa, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westmeath, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Cardigan, E.
De La Warr, E.
Derby, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Mayo, E.
Orkney, E.
Pomfret, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Strange, E. (*D. Athol.*)
Vane, E.
Wilton, E.

De Vesci, V.
Doneraile, V.
Gort, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Melville, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.

Bangor, Bp.
Chichester, Bp.
Ely, Bp.
Llandaff, Bp.
London, Bp.
Bagot, L.
Bateman, L.
Bolton, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Denman, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Grantley, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Inchiquin, L.
Kingsdown, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Polwarth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saltersford, (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Tenterden, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Walsingham, L.
Wynford, L.

House adjourned at half past Ten o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, June 26, 1865.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Sir Arthur William Buller, knight. *for* Liskeard.

Select Committee — *Report* — Public Accounts [413].

Public Bills — *Second Reading* — Marriages (Lamborne) * [*Lords*] [237]; Admiralty, &c., Acts Repeal * [*Lords*] [242]; Admiralty Powers, &c. * [*Lords*] [243]; Dockyard Ports Regulation * [*Lords*] [244].

Committee—Clerical Subscription [*Lords*] [199]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [227]; Colonial Docks Loans * [226].

Report — Clerical Subscription [*Lords*] [199]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [227]; Colonial Docks Loans * [226].

Considered as amended—Inland Revenue * [207]; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction [*Lords*] [236]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [235]; Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. * [238].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [133]; Inland Revenue * [207]; Indemnity * [234]; Compound Spirits Warehousing * [233]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) * [209].

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES—27 & 28 *VICT.* c. 43.

QUESTION.

Sir MINTO FARQUHAR said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What progress is being made in insuring lives, and in purchasing Government Annuities under the Act 27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 43; and what number of contracts have been entered into by the Postmaster General in pursuance of that Act; at how many Post Offices such business has been transacted, and whether such business is carried on at any, and how many, of the old Savings Banks?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that he would not enter into any statistical account of proceedings under this Act, which had come into operation so recently that any observations founded on its working hitherto would prove deceptive. The Act came into operation immediately, but a considerable time necessarily intervened before machinery relating to matters of so grave a character could be finally arranged: 400 officers had been appointed, but, as yet, it had not been found possible to commence business over the face of the country generally. Progress must be made in such a matter step by step; and no doubt progress would be faster as they got further afield. With regard to the old savings banks, it was not found feasible to make satisfactory arrangements with them yet, owing to the great additional responsibility entailed by their new business of assurance. Several hundreds of transactions, however, had already been completed; and Mr. Scudamore, who was at the head of this department in the General Post Office, felt perfectly satisfied with the indications presenting themselves. The rules appeared to work well and to be understood by the parties, and no difficulty had been experienced by the Department in obtaining answers to questions from the persons applying. He had no doubt that by the next meeting of Parliament they should be in a position to give more ample information as to the progress made.

POOR LAW—THE HIGHWORTH UNION.

QUESTION.

Mr. TORRENS said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether any steps have been, or will be, taken by the Board to ascertain that Dr. Kennard, medical officer of the Highworth Union has discontinued to employ his assistant, which was animadverted on and forbidden in the Secretary's letter to Dr. Kennard, dated the 19th of April, 1865?

Viscount ENFIELD said, in reply, that in March last the Poor Law Board received a request from the Board of Guardians of the Highworth Union complaining of the neglect of their medical officer, and asking that an inquiry might be instituted into his conduct. Upon a review of the evidence it appeared that, although the visits of the medical officer were not frequent, his conduct did not require any particular censure. His assistant did not possess any legal qualification, and the Board pointed out the impropriety of his conduct in employing such a person, and a copy of the letter was sent to the Board of Guardians. It was not customary for the Board to inquire whether their directions had been carried out, as it was presumed that the Guardians would act upon them. He believed that no further complaint had been made respecting Dr. Kennard, but if any dissatisfaction should hereafter arise it would be the duty of the Board to make further inquiry.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Sir **HUGH CAIRNS** said, he wished to obtain some information from the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Robert Peel) with regard to the Irish Constabulary. That force was very considerable in point of numbers, and large grants had been made for its maintenance. There was at the head of the force in Dublin an officer of considerable experience in military service, who, although appointed recently to that position, was in every way worthy to succeed the other distinguished officer who had preceded him in the office of Inspector General of Constabulary. Some questions, however, had arisen under his rule as to the discipline of the force, and it was very desirable that the public mind should be reassured on the matter. A few weeks ago some very respectable and inoffensive gentlemen were walking in Belfast one Saturday night, when they passed two members of the constabulary force loitering in front of their barracks. They were standing in the middle of the pavement, and one of the gentlemen, in passing, happened to touch the leg of one of the policemen. They both became excessively indignant, used vituperative language, and accused these inoffensive gentlemen, to their surprise, of assaulting the police. According to law in Ireland, a magistrate alone could accept bail for any person charged with assaulting the constabulary, and one of these gentlemen, therefore, was kept in confinement till the following Monday morning. Upon the matter being brought before the two stipendiary magistrates and on a full investigation of the facts, it was satisfactorily proved that no assault had been committed, and that, if touched at all, it was only a touch which had been given accidentally to the leg of the constable. The magistrates, moreover, declared that the police had acted with great impropriety in making use of vituperative language, and in giving this gentleman in charge. A letter was thereupon addressed by the gentleman aggrieved to the Inspector General in Dublin, representing what had occurred, but Colonel Wood did not think the matter came under his jurisdiction, and left the party aggrieved to take such steps as he might be advised. A second letter was addressed to Colonel Wood, pointing out that a civil action against a sub-constable of police was, as a remedy, wholly inefficient, and that if anything could come properly under the cognizance of the Inspector General of Constabulary it must be such as this. To this second letter the following reply was sent by Colonel Wood:—

> "Constabulary Office, Dublin Castle, May 30.
>
> "Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 29th ult., I can only say, in addition to what I have already stated, that if a member of the constabulary force exceeds or neglects his duty as a peace officer, such an offence does not properly form a subject for investigation by me. The steps to be taken in such cases are pointed out in the 19th section of the 6th *Will.* IV. c. 13; and I shall always be ready to afford every facility in my power in the investigation before the proper tribunal of any charge of the nature referred to.
>
> "I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
>
> "J. Stewart Wood, Colonel, Inspector General.
>
> "Mr. Arthur Ward,
> "52, Townsend Street, Belfast."

If a constable or sub-constable of police exceeded or neglected his duty, and such excess or neglect of duty did not properly form a subject for investigation by the Inspector General, he did not clearly see what was the use of an Inspector General at all. The gallant officer had entirely mistaken the effect of the Act of Parliament to which he pointed, which was to give power to the commanding officer of the force throughout the length and breadth of the land, in case they thought proper to do so, to bring offending constables before the magistrates, and have them fined; but there never had been any intention of superseding or abrogating their proper functions by any enactment. By the Act of 1836 any member of the force guilty of neglect or violation of duty was liable to a penalty not exceeding £5, recoverable before a magistrate. The object of that provision was to give the commanding officer power to bring the offender before a magistrate, and get a penalty imposed, and stop it out of the pay of the offender. He wished to know whether the Government approved the doctrine laid down by the Inspector General, that it was his duty to sit in Dublin Castle with his arms folded, and do nothing when complaints were made. Another case which had attracted much attention occurred in the county Sligo, where a young woman, who had incurred the displeasure of her relatives by a change of religion, was beaten severely by them in the open street, in presence of a sub-inspector of constabulary and three constables, who all refused to interfere because they said it was a "family matter." A mixed bench of magistrates declared in that case that the police had acted with great impropriety. The sub-inspector was fined £2, the bench at the same time declaring their opinion that the case was one in which ulterior proceedings ought to be taken. But here, again, according to an answer given by the Government in another place, all that the Inspector General had done was to remove, or talk of removing, these members of the police force to another part of Ireland, in the case of the sub-inspector as soon as his health permitted, and in the case of the constables as soon as opportunity offered. But what punishment was that to the offending parties? what satisfaction was it to the aggrieved party? and what had the other districts done that members of the force found guilty of misconduct elsewhere should be quartered upon them? These matters were notorious, and excited grave distrust in regard to the discipline of the force. Every one had heard that the constabulary force in Ireland was more of a military than a police force, and he had been somewhat surprised not long since in the north of Ireland to see what he took to be a dragoon regiment in undress. He asked "What regiment of cavalry that was?" and was told that it was not a regiment of cavalry at all, but a body of the mounted police. These men rode better horses, and were better turned out, than many regiments of cavalry that he had seen. The sight was very creditable, no doubt, to the men and their officers, but they did not resemble a body of peace officers. Another question which he wished to ask referred to the proposal to substitute a large body of the constabulary for the local force of the town of Belfast. He should be glad to know when that force might be expected to enter upon the performance of their duties, and also whether any arrangements had been made or would be made for the force to be drilled as night watchmen and detective policemen. The hon. Member for Clonmel told the House the other night that an attempt to use the constabulary force as night watchmen in the borough had failed, and that they had proved themselves to be inefficient in the discharge of their duty. He had also been told that in the city of Cork, where the duty of a police force was discharged by the constabulary, they guarded the city by day, but that at night several night watchmen were employed by private firms. The Commissioners, having regard to the state of feeling in Belfast, had recommended that the police force should be proportioned to the various religious denominations in that town, and they objected to the present local force as not being constituted in that manner. Was that recommendation approved by the Government, and did they mean to carry it out?

Mr. HADFIELD said, he must protest against the idea of apportioning a certain number of policemen according to the religious sentiments of a town. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman mean that the Presbyterians who drew the *Regium Donum* were to be allowed to choose a certain number of constabulary of their own sentiments? He trusted that no such principle would be admitted.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that before the Chief Secretary replied he wished to refer to another subject. The House was aware that a conversation took place on Friday relative to the Report of the Committee on the Tenure and Improvement of Land in Ireland. He wished to know whether the Government intended to inflict upon themselves the trouble—he would not say the disgrace—of embodying in a Bill the Report of the Committee. The House had been told that a measure would be brought in, if not by the Government, yet by the Chairman of the Committee, carrying into effect the recommendations of that Committee. He would recommend the Government not to take that course, because the Report was in direct opposition to the evidence and to the only sensible plan of adjustment that could ever be adopted for the settlement of the question. The Committee proposed to perpetuate the altogether useless Act of 1860, and recommended that the principle of that Act should not be interfered with. That measure had never been of the slightest advantage to the tenant-farmer of Ireland, no amendment of it would give any satisfaction. The Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Cardwell) expressed a decided opinion the other night that the Committee had done a great service in terminating the tenant-right agitation in Ireland. He denied that the action of the Committee had been such as to effect that result. He was, on the contrary, convinced that the extraordinary conclusion to which the Committee had so suddenly arrived would supply an additional incentive to agitation on the subject, and that a future Government would be compelled to bring in a measure on the subject. The Report of the Committee was a grievous insult to those who had devoted their time and attention to the question of tenant-right in Ireland. He did not know whether his noble Friend (Lord Naas) who was, he believed, the main author of the Report of the Committee, was of the same mind with the Government, but he should be glad to learn whether any intention existed to deal with the subject in a practical manner.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he regretted that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hennessy) had thought proper to renew the question of the Report of the Tenure of Lands Committee. He was not present when the matter was discussed on Friday night, but he was prepared to endorse the opinion of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Cardwell). Whether the Report of the Committee would put an end to the agitation on tenant-right in Ireland he could not say; but upon that Committee sat for many weeks several Members of the House who had given the subject the most careful and assiduous attention. Several witnesses were examined, and whatever might be the effect upon the minds of the people of Ireland, they must give the Committee credit for discussing the question in a fair and candid spirit. He could not, of course, say what course the Government might determine to take next Session. What they must all desire was that either the Government, if it thought fit, or, if not, that some independent Member should bring in a Bill and attempt to settle this vexed question in a fair and equitable manner, and upon some principle the justice of which every one would admit. He would take this opportunity of answering a question put to him the other night about Doyle, the "cosherer." He found that on the 7th of May, after the matter had been mentioned in the House, but before he was memorialized on the subject, the Lord Lieutenant had exercised his prerogative of pardon and had released Doyle, who had been convicted under the provisions of an Act now repealed. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast (Sir Hugh Cairns) had remarked on what he had characterized as the singular views taken of the discipline of the constabulary force, and had again alluded to the case of Mr. Ward. When the hon. and learned Gentleman called attention to the case the other night he (Sir Robert Peel) undertook to write at once upon the subject to the Inspector General, Colonel Wood, and he would read the letter—

> "Whitehall, June 10, 1865.
>
> "Dear Colonel Wood,—Sir Hugh Cairns brought under the notice of the House last evening the case of a Mr. Ward, living in Townsend Street, Belfast, who appears to have been roughly treated by a police constable while on patrol duty, and, as alleged, without committing any offence whatever, to have been locked up for thirty-six hours, when upon the hearing of the magistrates he was at once ordered to be discharged. Constabulary Inspector Williams, who appears to have some relations with Mr. Kirbey, the editor of the *Belfast Newsletter*, told the editor that the case had been reported to the Castle, and that he expected an inquiry. I shall be glad if you would favour me with particulars of this case, with report of Constabulary Inspector Williams, and if the statement made last evening is correct I would suggest the expediency of a full inquiry into the conduct of the constable.—"I am, yours truly,
>
> "Robert Peel."

The subject was brought before the House on the 9th of June, and he wrote on the 10th, so that the hon. and learned Gentleman must see that he lost no time. The hon. and learned Member had read the second letter of the Inspector General in answer to a letter from Mr. Ward, asking for some additional explanations. He (Sir Robert Peel) did not see anything in that communication to find fault with. The Inspector General acted according to Act of Parliament and the rules of the constabulary, and gave a very proper answer. Colonel Wood, in reply to his (Sir Robert Peel's) letter of the 10th, wrote as follows:—

> "I will endeavour to explain the case to you as far as I know it. I need hardly say that I can have no desire to screen an offending member of the constabulary; but it has, I understand, always been the custom, and I fully concur in the propriety of it, to make a distinction between derelictions of duty as peace officers and mere breaches of constabulary regulations." [The hon. and learned Gentleman would admit that.] "The latter class, which I intended to epitomize by the word 'Discipline,' are very fit subjects for investigation by our constabulary courts; the public have nothing to do with them. But it is otherwise with the former class, and especially when the public are the accusers, and the law has made provision accordingly (*vide* 6 William IV., chapter 13, section 19), which affords any person having a just complaint against the constabulary the means of redress. Were offences of this nature referred for investigation to our constabulary courts decision would seldom be received as final or satisfactory; but I cannot conceive any course preferable to that of bringing such complaints before the ordinary tribunals of the country."

Now, he thought that answer a very proper one, and one which could not but be satisfactory to the hon. and learned Gentleman. The hon. and learned Gentleman shook his head, but he was bound to say he thought Colonel Wood's answer quite satisfactory. He was quite sure, Colonel Wood having now succeeded Sir H. Brownrigg, that the force would prove its efficiency and discipline under the management of so able an officer. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also referred to a case which had occurred in Sligo, and which had been brought under the notice of the Government by Lord Westmeath in another place. That case was, no doubt, a bad one. It was that of a girl who having been in Scotland was induced to change her religion, and when she came back to the town of Ballisodare, in the county of Sligo, she met some of her relatives, who wanted to prevail on her to return to the religion she had left. A scene of some violence took place; there was a sub-inspector of police present with four other constables, and they certainly did not do their duty. The poor girl was kept in durance vile for some time, and was then released. The Government instituted an inquiry into the case, and sub-inspector Burke was severely reprimanded by the Inspector General, fined by the magistrates, and ordered to go at his own expense to a remote district in the county of Donegal. The hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to think that it was nothing to be removed and to be severely reprimanded. But, in the first place, the man removed had to pay the expenses of his removal, and in the next place he had his chances of promotion injured in consequence of having incurred the bad opinion of the Inspector General. He fell ill, however, and remained in Sligo, but was not allowed to do duty. He had received a letter from the Inspector General, stating that sub-inspector Burke had sent in his papers and retired from the force, feeling that his chances of promotion had been materially affected. As regarded the other four constables, two had been acquitted and were allowed to remain in Sligo, the other two had been removed and severely censured. They had been dismissed from the force in that particular locality. He would admit that the case was a bad one, but he would put it to the House whether, in a force of some 12,500 men, instances of misconduct such as this must not sometimes occur; but whenever they did Government at once dealt with them in a stringent and determined way. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) had said that he saw the horse police exercising, and that he took them for a cavalry regiment in undress. Now, that was a great compliment to the skill and discipline of the men. It was a credit to the force rather than otherwise to have them spoken of in that manner by the hon. and learned Gentleman. He had been asked several questions touching the Bill now passing through Parliament, and he would endeavour to reply to them. But, first, he would reassure the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield), and tell him that his alarm might subside. The Government had no notion, as the hon. Gentleman seemed to apprehend, of increasing the *Regium Donum* with a view to the payment of the Presbyterian members of the constabulary force. The *Regium Donum*, as he had endeavoured to explain for many years, went to pay the clergymen of the Presbyterian body in Ireland, and the hon. Gentleman need not be at all apprehensive that it would be increased for the purpose of paying the Presbyterians in the constabulary. He had been asked when the Bill now passing through Parliament would be put into operation. The Government would endeavour to bring it into operation at the earliest possible period. It would probably pass into an Act by the 4th of next month; if so, it would be notified in the *Gazette* of the 14th of July, and it was the intention of the Government to put it in force by the 10th, or at the very latest the 20th of August next. They were making every exertion to do so, and he hoped they would not be disappointed. As to the mode in which the men would be drilled, they would be drilled in the same way as they were for Cork, Waterford, and other places. They were to be armed with a police baton when they were simply on day duty in the town. The hon. and learned Member was in error in supposing that the constabulary did not do night patrol duty in the city of Cork. No doubt there were private watchmen there, but the constabulary did night watchman's duty in Cork, Waterford, Limerick, and other places, and he believed to the entire satisfaction of the parties concerned. In Cork, at all events. He had been asked the other night whether a distinctive mark would be provided for the constabulary. He wrote to the Inspector General, stating that it would be very desirable in cases of necessity to have such a means of identifying the men, and steps had been taken to provide such a distinctive mark. He had been asked whether anything had been done to carry into effect a certain recommendation of the Commissioners. Now, in his opinion, that recommendation was an unfortunate one, and he did not approve of it. The Commissioners reported that

> "In selecting men for Belfast there need be no difficulty in preserving among them the proportion which the numbers of the different congregations there bear to each other, and in preserving it till a wiser and happier time renders it unnecessary to take such a circumstance into consideration."

It should be recollected that recommendation had reference to a local force of 164 men, the whole of whom were Protestants with the exception of five. The proportions belonging to each religious denomination in Belfast were, omitting decimals—Roman Catholics, 34 per cent; Established Church, 24 per cent; Presbyterians, 35 per cent; and the other denominations, 6 per cent. It would appear, therefore, that the force ought to be thus constituted,—120 men should belong to the Established Church, 160 should be Roman Catholics, 170 Presbyterians; or, taking the broad distinction between Roman Catholics and Protestants, 160 should be of the former and 290 of the latter denomination. The Government would endeavour, as far as possible, to follow the recommendations of the Commissioners. He would give the hon. and learned Gentleman that assurance, for he was anxious that all parties should be fairly dealt with, and had no wish to give the preponderance to either. The Government would take steps to ascertain the religion of the constabulary, with a view to carry out the recommendation of the Commissioners. That Return he hoped would be furnished by the 10th of August, and it would of necessity be laid before Parliament. It was proposed to give 450 men to Belfast. There were 50 men now in the county of the town of Belfast from the county of Antrim; and these men would remain there. Then there were 90 men of the reserve, together with 160 men from the different depôts; 50 recruits from the depôt would also be sent there, and 100 fresh men from other counties. These would make up the 450 men. This was the best arrangement that could be made, after anxious discussion with the Inspector General. As regarded what he could not help calling the most unfortunate Amendment which his hon. and learned Friend carried by accident the other night by a majority of two, it could not possibly be worked satisfactorily. However, this arrangement had been made—Colonel Hillier had gone down to Belfast, and he would ask the mayor whether there would be any objection to ascertain the probable number of men in the Belfast police who wished to come into the constabulary. The great difficulty was in removing these local policemen from the depôt, in order that they might be drilled. He was afraid that their removal would subject their wives and families to great hardships; he hardly knew what was to become of them, and hoped that his hon. and learned Friend would provide for them. Now that these debates had come to a close, he hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would think that he had treated this question in a fair and liberal spirit. As to Mr. Ward's case, he thought that it ought not to be brought twice before Parliament, and that that gentleman might have been satisfied with the explanations of the Inspector General. There were cases in which a want of discipline might be occasionally shown; but the authorities always endeavoured to redress this on the first opportunity, and he hoped that after the Bill was brought into operation on the 10th of August, all parties would unite to give the new system a fair and honest trial.

Lord NAAS said, he thought the House ought to feel indebted to his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns) for bringing under notice not so much any particular case as the principles on which the force ought to be managed. He wholly dissented from the view taken by Colonel Wood as to what should be the duties of the constabulary authorities in such a case. Colonel Wood appeared to think that if an offence punishable by law was committed by a constable, he was not to take any steps in the matter unless it was brought before a court of justice by some other person. This was an entire departure from the principles on which the discipline of the force had been conducted hitherto, and he believed that if the opinion of Sir Duncan M'Gregor were taken, it would be found to differ wholly from the view taken by Colonel Wood. In case of any dereliction of duty by a constable, the constabulary authorities themselves should be the persons to bring the case under the cognizance of a court of justice at the earliest opportunity, and not leave it to any persons who might choose to prefer a complaint. It would be most unfortunate if it should go abroad that unless the public took notice of offences committed by constables they would not be taken notice of at all. He did not quite understand what was intended about the night duty at Belfast. Was it to be like that of the metropolitan police in Dublin? [Sir ROBERT PEEL: That is what we mean.] He was glad to hear that; and also what the right hon. Baronet had said with regard to the religious denominations in the force. Of course it was impossible to lay down any rigid rule as to the proportion which the respective denominations should bear to the force. All they wanted was, that there should be a proper infusion of the various denominations, and that nobody should say there was anything like a sectarian tendency in the composition of the force.

MR. MAGUIRE said, his hon. Friend (Mr. Hennessy) had endeavoured most persistently, without any means of forming an accurate opinion, and although no Motion on the subject was before the House, to fill the minds of the Irish people with discontent, and convince them that there was no possible chance of getting anything like justice upon the tenant-right question from this House. He had endeavoured to represent that it was impossible so to improve the Act of 1860 as to do any appreciable good in Ireland. Now, he utterly denied this, and did so on far higher authority than that of his hon. Friend. O'Connell was inclined, if he could not get a whole loaf, to take half; and he denied that his hon. Friend had sufficient knowledge of the proceedings of the Committee, or of the evidence taken before it, to assert with anything like authority that even though Mr. Cardwell's Act still remained in force it was not possible to make it a very valuable and easily worked Act. He was opposed to the principle of the Act, but he believed it might be enormously improved to the advantage of the country. Mr. Curling had distinctly agreed with Mr. Cardwell and a majority of the Committee; but Mr. Curling gave such valuable suggestions that if they were carried into law an enormous change for the better would take place in the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland. He did not think it was a good or wise policy to fill the minds of the people of Ireland, ready as they were to fly from the country, with despair of any future improvement. He believed that if the Government were to legislate in the spirit of Mr. Curling's advice they would do great things for Ireland. The real cause why the Act of 1860 would not work was, not because the tenant could not get compensation unless he improved with the sanction of the landlord, but because the machinery was too cumbrous and intricate, and because the inducements were too small for persons in Ireland to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act. Nevertheless, the machinery could be made more simple, the inducements larger, and the protection could be made secure. In reply to some of the observations of the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy), he denied that he had made any promise on the part of the Government, though he had expressed his hope that they would bring in a Bill on the subject, and if they did not he would be ready to lay a Bill on the table at the beginning of the Session.

MR. SCULLY said, he hoped the people of Ireland would not, on the one hand, grow desponding upon the question, and would not, on the other hand, allow themselves to be deluded. He regretted that the Irish Members generally had not accepted the measure of 1854, which was a better one, he feared, than any they had at present a chance of obtaining.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy) said a few words on this subject, and the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Maguire) replied. Although the question of the Irish constabulary was properly brought before the House, I do not think that the subject-matter under discussion now—the tenure of land—can be said to relate to the third reading of the Appropriation Bill. Therefore, to pursue this discussion further would be out of order.

MR. VANCE said, he wished to refer to a subject connected with the Irish police force, and one, therefore, which he would not be out of order in introducing. It was one in which an injury had been done to the public, to the constabulary, and to an individual. In former years the clothing of the Irish constabulary was supplied by a Dublin tradesman, who had fulfilled his engagements in the most unobjectionable manner. But last year the contract had been taken from him and given to Mr. Tate, an enterprizing contractor of Limerick, some influence having, it appeared, been used in that House to obtain its transference. Mr. Tate, however, who had been engaged in supplying the Confederate troops in America had not complied with the terms of his engagements, for he had undertaken to produce the clothing by the 15th of August, and had not by that time supplied any portion of it. The consequence was that the constabulary had been kept for a considerable period without a change of clothing, and much inconvenience had been created. Under these circumstances, he wished to ask the noble Marquess the under Secretary of War, whether the authorities at his office would be prepared to restore the contract to the tradesman who had for several years fulfilled its conditions?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was of opinion that no act of injustice whatever had been committed. Prior to the year 1864 there was no contract for making the clothing of the Irish constabulary, the cloth being sent in what was termed a "basted" state to the various stations, and an allowance given to the men for making up the clothing. The attention of the Government had been called to that state of things by Mr. Tate, who undertook to cut out and make up the clothing for the same price as that allowed to the constabulary for making it up. That proposal, which, if successful, would have proved a considerable saving to the public, appeared so advantageous that the War Department, having had considerable and favourable experience of Mr. Tate as a contractor for army clothing, adopted it for one year. It was quite true that the clothing of the constabulary was not supplied in August, as it should have been by the terms of the contract, but it was only fair to Mr. Tate to state that, although the Department had no reason to be altogether satisfied with the performance of the contract, he believed that Mr. Tate considered he had very good reason for the delay, inasmuch as he did not receive at the proper time the necessary "size roll" from the officers of the constabulary. He (the Marquess of Hartington) admitted that the contract had not been carried out in a manner satisfactory to the Government, and they were now about to receive contracts, without reverting to the old practice, for the clothing of the constabulary. The patterns for clothing would be exhibited in Dublin shortly, and the competition would be perfectly open.

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION BILL.

[*Lords.*] [BILL 199.] COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill."

Mr. HADFIELD said, he condemned the measure as affording no real relief or comfort to the minds of many clergymen of the Established Church, who entertained conscientious scruples in respect to the forms of subscription hitherto adopted. The Bill in no way dealt with the Articles of the Church or with those of its formularies and ceremonies, which urgently required re-adjustment. Among the latter were the Baptismal Service, the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, the Catechism, and the Burial Service, parts of which were most objectionable, not to Nonconformists merely, but to many excellent clergymen of the Established Church. But what was still the language of the heads of the Church? Did they hold out any hope that these questions should be dealt with and settled? No; they said they could not devise another or a better form of Services, and consequently clergymen would still have to read a Burial Service which in some cases must be most revolting to them, when they considered what the professions, the principles, and the moral life of the deceased had been. The Romanist practices indulged in by many clergymen receiving Protestant pay were obnoxious to the public. But this Bill would not afford any relief to those who objected to these fantastic displays, and who desired that they should be put an end to. He deplored the way in which Parliament treated these questions, and feared that it would bring heavy reproach upon them as legislators in the eyes of posterity. He would offer no opposition to the Speaker leaving the chair; but there was one notice of Amendment given by the hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin to which he could not help adverting. That Amendment declared that the Queen's Majesty was, under God, the only Supreme Governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things as temporal. He thought that Amendment would, if carried, excite throughout the United Kingdom the most determined hostility. He believed in one head of the Church—Jesus Christ—who was its sole governor and head, whether on earth or in heaven. To Him alone the Protestantism of this country would yield obedience and subjection. He did not oppose this Bill, but he thought the paltry and unworthy compromise which it made would yield no satisfaction to the minds of those for whom it was intended.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Declaration of Assent).

MR. ROLT said, considerable doubt was entertained by some clergymen as to the effect of the words at the end of the declaration, "except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." It had been suggested that the exception was necessary to provide for the occasional prayers which were ordered by the Queen in Council on fast or thanksgiving days, or on any emergency. That was his own opinion, and if the Government would state that that was the object of the exception, the doubt which had been expressed on the subject would be removed.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he did not think the words liable to the objection stated. He did not know whether the hon. and learned Gentleman had read a very valuable paper appended to the Report of the Commissioners which had been drawn up by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole), and which gave a most admirable history of all the declarations on this subject which had been required to be taken from time to time, the writer being in favour of one uniform and simple declaration. This part of the declaration had been drawn up very carefully. The words were limited to the occasions mentioned by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Rolt), and he did not think they were liable to any real objection.

MR. WALPOLE said, that the view of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Rolt) entirely agreed with that of the Commissioners.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (The Declaration against Simony).

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he must express his regret that the Commissioners had recommended any alteration in the declaration without an amendment in the law of simony. The alteration proposed was that the person taking the declaration had made no payment or compact which to the best of his knowledge was "simoniacal." These words would offer a loophole to a robust conscience and a trap to a tender conscience. He could not help thinking that it was better to retain the former language of the declaration than to alter it in so objectionable a manner. He begged, accordingly, to move that the old wording be restored, not with a view in the thin state of the House of pressing it to a division, but in order to place the opinion upon record.

MR. NEATE said, he concurred with much that had been said by the hon. Member for Devizes, but thought it would be better to omit all reference to simony. Simony had been extended to acts which were not originally simoniacal, and he thought the punishment for simony might safely be left to the penalty of forfeiture, and the provisions of the statute of Elizabeth. The word "simony" had been not only misapplied but fraudulently applied by the canonists, and he, for one, had always been of opinion that it would be better for all parties if vacant livings could be sold, just in the same way that reversions to livings not vacant were sold under the existing system.

MR. LYGON said, he had never been able to comprehend the exact reason why the alteration was made. So far from preventing clergymen from obtaining a living by unworthy means, it left the offence, if it existed, to be defined, not by certain well known rules, but according to the conscience of the individual. It was admitted that the law of simony was in an unsatisfactory state, and the declaration, as it stood, presented a great snare to persons of tender consciences. If the hon. Member for Devizes pressed his Amendment to a division he should vote for it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the question was really one of words. The proposed declaration was in substance the same as the existing declaration. The proposed declaration was intended to meet persons whose scruples were excessive, and who might say, "The matter on which I am asked to make a declaration is not simoniacal so far as my knowledge is concerned, but how do I know whether in law it may be deemed simoniacal or not?" The Commissioners thought that to meet such persons' objections the declaration ought merely to require an averment that nothing had taken place which, to the best of their knowledge, was simoniacal. Refusing to speak as to a matter of law about which they were imperfectly informed, they were quite prepared to declare that "to their knowledge" there had been nothing simoniacal in connection with the transaction.

MR. WALPOLE said, he could confirm the statement of the hon. and lerrned Gentleman as to the reasons inducing the Commissioners to assent to the alteration.

The uncertainty of the law as to what constitutes simony had raised a difficulty in the way of tender consciences, which it was hoped to remove by the amended form of declaration, the declaration itself remaining in substance the same. The uncertainty of the law on the subject rendered it highly expedient that an amendment or repeal should take place. But until the law was amended or repealed, it was in such a state that many of the clergy objected to make the declaration without the qualifying words referred to; and that was the sole reason why they were introduced.

MR. SELWYN said, that when the Amendment of the hon. Member for Devizes was disposed of, words could be added to the declaration preserving the common form, according to which the declarant spoke "to the best of his knowledge and belief."

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he would accept the suggestion.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Subscription and Oaths on Ordination).

SIR GEORGE GREY moved a verbal Amendment, substantially restoring the Bill to its original state according to the recommendation of the Commissioners. The oath taken in England was the obsolete oath of William and Mary, while the Irish clergy took the oath prescribed by an Act of the present reign. The Amendment gave effect to the recommendation of the Commissioners that the oath should be uniform in both countries, and the oath taken by the Irish clergy would be the one adopted.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS (RETIRING PENSIONS) BILL—[BILL 133.]

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

COLONEL SYKES said, that Clause 2 enacted that a Colonial Governor who had been in the enjoyment of a salary of £5,000 a year should receive a retiring pension of £1,000 a year if he had served for four years. This provision was, however, qualified by Clause 4, and he wished to ask, first, the minimum age at which a Governor would receive the full pension; secondly, what length of time a Governor must absolutely have served; and, thirdly, whether a person would obtain his pension for cumulative services as Governor and a member of the Civil Service.

MR. WHITE said, he would like to know what would be the cost to the public of the engagements in this Act, and the amount of the pensions which would accrue under it. According to the Colonial Office Lists it appeared we had thirty-two Governors who derived salaries varying from £800 to £10,000 per annum, and twelve lieutenant-governors and presidents administering government with salaries varying from £500 to £1,800. It appeared to him to be rather late in the day to bring in a Bill of this sort. We had gone on hitherto without the machinery which it proposed, and he was quite sure that if there had been any absolute or pressing necessity for it, a scheme would long ago have been brought forward, because these Governors belonged to a class which had always plenty of friends.

MR. ADDERLEY said, he could not agree with the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. White) that it was rather late in the day to introduce such a Bill. In his opinion it was rather early in the day to retrace our colonial policy by imposing on the taxpayers of this country the payment of a portion of the salaries which the colonies ought to pay to their Governors. He knew very well that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cardwell) would tell him that the Governors stood in a different category to all other civil servants, and that while performing a service to the colonies, they also performed a distinct service to the mother country, but the answer was not satisfactory. He did not wish to impede the Bill, but he should enter his protest against it. If we were asked to take this first retrograde step, he hoped Parliament would not be asked next year to take another, and to pay a portion of the salaries of other colonial officers. There was no reason why we should not do for the Colonial Secretaries, for instance, what we now intended to do for the Governors. The Colonial Secretaries frequently acted for the Governors, and had as good a claim. In fact, he did not see why, according to the principle of this Bill, we should not go further and pension all the colonial officers. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would assure the House that if before Parliament met again the new constitution of our colonies in North America were formed, in which case the Governor General would have the appointment of the other Governors, we should not have to pay the pensions of those Governors.

Mr. CARDWELL said, in answer to the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes), that there was no confusion between the two clauses referred to by him. That the first clause simply defined what a first-class pension should be, and was not otherwise operative at all. The 4th clause was operative, and enabled the Secretary of State to give that first-class pension in the case of three classes—where a man has served eighteen years; where a man has served twenty-five years, at least ten of which must have been passed as Governor, and the rest in the Civil Service; and where a man has served fifteen years and been permanently disabled in the course of the discharge of his duty. The words were perfectly plain. The period at which a pension was to be granted was either upon attaining the minimum age of sixty years length of service being the chief qualification, or earlier in the single case of a man being permanently disabled by illness in the discharge of his duties. With regard to the question asked by his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton (Mr. White), as he could not tell who would cease to be employed and at what particular period, he could not say what the precise extent of the burden to be borne by the country would be. By the first operation of the Bill a change would be imposed of much less than the £10,000 a year referred to in the printed correspondence, and that was not a very serious burden to be laid upon the public. With respect to the remarks of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Adderley), he would content himself with saying that the service which a Governor rendered to the mother country would make so small a charge as was imposed by the Bill justifiable. The principle upon which he defended the Bill was this—*nemo tenetur ad impossibilia*, because you could not raise a common pension fund from fifty different colonies, and, therefore, if pensions were to be paid at all they must be paid out of the Imperial Treasury. He did not regard this Bill as a retrograde step. It showed that they were disposed to estimate at their value the public services rendered by a most meritorious class of men.

Bill read 3°, and *passed.*

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

[BILL 227.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Lord HENLEY said, that he did not rise for the purpose of opposing the House going into Committee, but he did not think that the passing of Continuance Acts was the way to get rid of these turnpike trusts. The Committee which sat upon this subject thought it quite feasible to abolish turnpikes altogether. They were an unfair and inconvenient mode of collecting money, pressed unequally upon different places, and were very uneconomical in working. The whole of the toll income collected under turnpike trusts was £1,043,185, and to collect this amount 4,400 toll-gates were maintained. The annual expense of each bar must be something like £25, so that the total expense was £110,000, or more than 10 per cent upon the whole toll income collected. In the present Act only eleven trusts were mentioned which were actually intended to expire, and, as there were nearly 1,100 trusts altogether, a very considerable time would elapse in getting rid of these if they were only abolished at the slow rate of eleven a year. He wanted to know why 160 trusts which were out of debt were not abolished and the roads thrown on the parishes. He hoped that during the recess this subject would be considered by the Home Office, and that in another year either the Government or some influential Member would bring in a Bill which would put an end to the obnoxious system of turnpikes.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Continuance of Acts, except 7 G. 4. c. lxxxv., 7 G. 4. c. cxxv., 7 & 8 G. 4. c. vii., 9 G. 4. c. cviii., 1 W. 4. c. viii., 3 W. 4. c. liii., 3 W. 4. c. lxi., 3 & 4 W. 4. c. c., 2 Vict. c. xiv., 5 Vict, c. xlv., 6 & 7 Vict. c. cviii., 13 & 14 Vict. c. lxxxv).

Mr. LOCKE said, he should again move, as an Amendment, the addition of the words "also an Act 5 *Geo*. IV. c. 56, for repairing the Lower Road from Greenwich to Woolwich," with a view to put an end to that trust by exempting it from the operation of the Bill. He had brought on the subject one night last week, and on a division carried his Amendment by eighteen to fourteen, but as there were not sufficient Members present to form a House he was bound to bring on the question again. This trust had been continued for nineteen years, and the debt was £2,400, but if the trust was continued from year to year he doubted whether the debt would ever be liquidated. On the north side of the Thames the trusts were abolished without any regard to the question whether they were in debt or not.

MR. T. G. BARING said, that the trusts on the north of the Thames were not abolished before their debt was paid off. He maintained that the Bill was in accordance with the legislation affecting the trusts on the north side of the river, and equitable as between the public and private individuals. He regretted that the hon. and learned Gentleman was not satisfied with what had been done by the Home Office in regard to this trust. The trust was indebted to the extent of £2,000, the debt originally being £12,000. An arrangement was made by which the existing debt was to be paid off at the rate of £500 a year, and if the trustees were advised to come to Parliament for a Bill, the effect would be to increase the debt. He was prepared to insert that trust in the schedule, but he insisted on the understanding that the matter might be considered and dealt with by a Committee of Parliament next year according to its merits.

COLONEL PENNANT said, that the aggregate debt had been diminished from £9,000,000 to £4,000,000. There was no instance of a debt on a turnpike trust being swept away by a Select Committee of that House.

COLONEL FRENCH said, that through the mismanagement of individuals having control of the matter, the money which had been borrowed on the security of the tolls, instead of having been gradually repaid, still remained as a charge upon the tolls, and it was now seriously proposed that Parliament should pay off the claim. He should not divide the Committee upon the question, but he trusted that the Government would take good security for the fulfilment of the engagement. He could not understand why the country should be called on to make good the losses caused by errors of judgment on the part of turnpike trustees. Everybody advancing money on turnpike trusts knew that the security was limited to twenty or thirty years. The trusts had been abused, and the House of Commons had in many cases renewed the Acts. Last year the Government undertook that this trust should be inquired into by a Committee, and if that pledge had been redeemed there would have been no need for them to come forward and now say that they would do it next year.

MR. COX said, he advised the acceptance of the Government offer. He objected to a different system of legislation taking place with regard to turnpike trusts on the south side of the Thames to what had taken place on the north side of the Thames.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, that he also advised the acceptance. As far as his constituents were concerned they were divided. The toll-payers liked the Bill; those who would have to pay in future disapproved of it.

MR. LOCKE said, what he understood the hon. Gentleman to propose was, that the turnpike trust of the Woolwich and Greenwich lower road should be put into the schedule, and that next year he would not take it out, and that when a Bill should be brought in by the trustees of the road, as was done this year, he would not recommend them to withdraw it, and then put it into the exception clause. The effect of the arrangement, as he understood it, was, that for one year, and for one year only, the trust was to remain, and that the Government would have nothing to do with it next year, but would leave the trustees to bring in a Bill to be decided upon by Parliament. That would carry out what was proposed by the Home Office last year. On that understanding he was willing to accede to the proposal, but he should have preferred an Amendment declaring that the trust should, unless revised by special Act of Parliament, be abolished on the 1st of August in next year.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Schedule.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH moved to omit "1 *Geo.* IV. c. 69, an Act for repairing and improving several roads leading into and from Devizes, in the county of Wilts." He said that the trust did not come within the recommendations of the Committee of last year, and the person who had advanced money to the amount of £850 had threatened to seize the tolls if the trust were not omitted from the schedule.

MR. T. G. BARING said, the circumstances of the trust warranted some delay, and he was therefore willing to accede to the request of the hon. Member for Devizes, hoping that before next year some arrangement might be come to between the parties.

House *resumed.*

Bill *Reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

COUNTY COURTS EQUITABLE JURISDICTION BILL.

[*Lords.*] [Bill 236.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. **HENLEY** said, he wished to call attention to the condition of the prisoners who might be committed under the authority of the Bill. The power of commitment was unlimited. He supposed that the prisoners would come under the category of County Court or fraudulent debtors; and, if so, their condition would be almost penal. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Baronet at the head of the Home Department would make some regulation by way of safeguard on the subject.

Sir **GEORGE GREY** said, he was not certain that all the persons committed under this Bill would be in the position of County Court debtors, though some undoubtedly would be. He would look into the matter, however, that the hardship, if any, might be corrected. The treatment was defined by rules made by the Home Office, and not under an Act of Parliament.

Clause 20 (Imposing upon the Judge in certain cases the duty of settling the terms of appeals).

Mr. **MURRAY** said, there were many objections to this provision, and moved that it be struck out.

Mr. **MALINS** said, he thought this was an attempt to re-introduce a pernicious and abolished system. The same practice existed formerly in bankruptcy, and he had seen two days spent before the Judge in an attempt to settle the terms of an appeal.

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL** said, that in deference to the opinions which had been expressed, he was quite willing to allow the question of appeal to remain at large, and see how the system worked.

Clause *omitted.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

Mr. T. G. Baring

RAILWAY DEBENTURES, &c., REGISTRY BILL—[*Lords.*] [Bill 241.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Lord **NAAS** said, that the Bill had come down from the Lords, but as it appeared that it would meet with considerable opposition in that House its promoters had no wish to proceed with it during the present Session.

Second Reading *put off* for a fortnight.

House adjourned at a quarter after Eight o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 27, 1865.

MINUTES.] — *Sat First in Parliament* — The Earl of Morley, after the Death of his Father.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance * (226); Poor Law Board Continuance (227).

Second Reading—Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment * (200); Greenwich Hospital (179); Fire Brigade (Metropolis) * (215); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (216); Ayr Burghs Election * (186); Falmouth Borough * (201); Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * (212); Inland Revenue * (221); Indemnity * (222); Compound Spirits Warehousing * (224).

Committee — Prisons (155); Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment (199); Carriers' Act Amendment * (198); Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment [H.L.] * (211); Rochdale Vicarage [H.L.] * (213); Naval Discipline Act Amendment [H.L.] * (214); Sugar Duties and Drawbacks * (195).

Report — Carriers Act Amendment * (198); Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment [H.L.] * (211); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) * (208); Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) * (220); Rochdale Vicarage [H.L.] * (213); Naval Discipline Act Amendment [H.L.] * (214); Sugar Duties and Drawbacks * (195).

Third Reading — Land Debentures (Ireland) * (219); Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment * (168); Navy and Marine (Wills) * (169); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) * (184); Naval and Marine (Pay and Pensions) * (177); Harbours Transfer * (182); National Gallery (Dublin) * (196), and *passed.*

TYNE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The Earl of **ELLENBOROUGH**, having presented two petitions from Tynemouth and South Shields against this Bill, which stood for third reading to-night, said, he must, in the first place, explain how it happened that he had not presented these petitions earlier, that reason being that he had not seen the Bill put down on the paper. All he could now do was to present the petition and request the attention of the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) to them. He regretted to see that there was another Bill to be read the third time that night, by which it was intended to transfer to the Board of Trade all the powers now exercised by the Admiralty over the harbours of this country. Now that he looked on as a most unwise step, believing, as he did, that those powers would be much better exercised by the Admiralty, whose views were, generally speaking, of a higher nature, and whose first duty was towards the seamen. Up to recent times there was a bar on the harbour of the Tyne river, which was now, however, almost entirely removed. While that bar existed, a vessel, whatsoever dangers she might previously have encountered, the moment she passed it found herself in still water; but now that it had been taken away, the great dangers to be overcome were those to be met with in the inmost recesses of the harbour itself. During the last year nineteen vessels had been stranded at the entrance to the harbour, instead of eight or ten which was the usual average, and in the case of three of these vessels, forty-four lives were lost. He feared that so long as the harbour remained as it was, dreadful loss of life must be expected to take place year after year. Under those circumstances he hoped the noble Duke at the head of the Admiralty would allow the third reading of the Bill to be postponed until he had obtained the opinion of a competent officer sent down expressly to report on the present position of the harbour.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET thought the proposal of the noble Earl was scarcely reasonable in the case of a Private Bill which had passed through the House of Commons and been before a Committee of their Lordships' House. Those who were interested in the navigation had had ample opportunities of being heard before Committees of that and the other House, and it was not fair that they should withhold their opposition until the third reading of the Bill, and then ask that it should be postponed until the Admiralty had instituted an inquiry into the subject. The Admiralty had, in fact, nothing to do with the Tyne Harbour, which, like most other commercial harbours, was a few years ago transferred to the management of the Board of Trade.

LORD RAVENSWORTH said, that the Committee of their Lordships which sat upon this Bill bestowed great attention upon it, and if any one had any complaint to make against its provisions, they ought to have appeared before the Committee and stated their objections.

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH said, that no doubt the petitions were intended to have been presented before the Bill was referred to a Committee. Unfortunately those from whom he received them omitted to inform him when the Bill would pass that stage, and it was only recently that he discovered it in the list of Bills waiting for third reading. He was as anxious as any one that the harbour of the Tyne should be improved, but no one could look at the chart of that harbour without seeing that the proper mode of improving it was to excavate the Black Middens.

EARL GREY said, he saw no necessity for adopting the course suggested by the noble Earl in reference to this Bill.

Bill read 3ª.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, before the reading of the Orders of the Day, I wish to make a communication to your Lordships on behalf of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the Dissolution of Parliament. After the statement which the Chairman of Committees was good enough to make to the House last night regarding the state of the Private business, I and one of my Colleagues communicated with Lord Palmerston on the subject. Her Majesty's Ministers greatly regret having to interfere with the finishing of the Private business before the House; but, at the same time, there are various and important reasons why the dissolution of Parliament should not be postponed for any considerable time after the Public business has been brought to a conclusion. Therefore, without giving any distinct pledge on the subject, Her Majesty's Government have thought it necessary to advise Her Majesty to prorogue Parliament on Thursday week, the 6th of July. With regard to the anticipated interference with the Private business, in consequence of the dissolution, I do not think the inconvenience will be so great as has been supposed, as, since the appeal made by the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees to the House, considerable progress has been made in that business. With regard to the class of Bills referred to by the noble Lord yesterday—namely, those to which parties are offering opposition—I do not think that the limitation of the time for the prorogation of Parliament will affect them in any great degree. It appears to me that there are weighty reasons to induce Her Majesty's Government not unnecessarily to delay the dissolution of Parliament. Such delay would cause great expense to candidates, who all earnestly wish to proceed as soon as possible with the elections. The delay would also most injuriously affect trade and manufactures, which are much affected by the electioneering contest about to take place, and I am quite sure a greater amount of evil would be caused to the country by delaying the dissolution, than would result from the non-completion of so much of the Private business as yet remains to be done. Under these circumstances Her Majesty's Ministers are of opinion that the prorogation should take place on Thursday the 6th July, which would give more than ample time for disposing of the Public business.

Lord REDESDALE: Of course I have not a word to say against the decision of Her Majesty's Government. It is no doubt their duty to do the best they can for the general interests of the country, and having come to the conclusion to dissolve Parliament at an early day I can no longer contend against that determination. I hope, however, that the amount of injury to those interested in the Private business will be less than was at first expected, as I believe that by the end of the Session there will be but few, if any, Private Bills undisposed of, as a great number of those Bills have been passed within the last few days, and in nearly every instance where the Bills will remain undisposed of the fault will rest with the parties themselves. I hope no attempt will be made to hang up any of the Private business until next Session—a course which in my opinion would be clearly wrong. Any intimation of such a nature would have the effect of preventing amicable arrangements between the contending parties which otherwise might possibly take place, and I am very glad that no notice of such an intention

has been given by the noble Earl. I think I shall be able this evening to appoint additional Committees, which will facilitate the disposal of the remaining business. I shall watch the progress of the business carefully, and we shall be enabled in a few days to see what prospect there will be of concluding it before the rising of the House.

PRIVATE BILLS.—RESOLUTION.

Standing Order No. 179. Sect. 1, *considered* (according to Order).

Lord REDESDALE *moved—*

> "That Wednesday next shall be considered as a sitting day with respect to any petition praying to be heard upon the merits against any Bill mentioned in either of the two classes of private Bills."

Lord BROUGHAM did not rise to oppose, but to second, Lord Redesdale's proposal for expediting the business, and hasten the dissolution so necessary for preserving the peace and for relieving all parties from the anxieties, labours, and enormous expense under which so many were now suffering. But he never could see measures taken to expedite the Private Business of Parliament without rendering the tribute of justice to the memory of the illustrious man whose loss we daily have to deplore on all questions, whether of peace or war, of foreign or domestic policy, his illustrious friend, the Great Duke, never to be replaced. When in conjunction with him he (Lord Brougham) had referred the new Standing Order to a Committee of this House, the Duke said, "Why not propose our great plan?" Lord Brougham answered that the Committee was certain to reject it. "Never mind," said the Duke, "we can but be defeated, and then we retreat upon the lesser one." Accordingly, we were defeated, and the present Standing Orders were adopted, first by the Committee, and then by the House, and effected a great improvement in our Private Business, and were afterwards, though with great reluctance, adopted by the other House. It was, however, a far inferior measure, as the Duke justly said, to that which they had worked out together. That was the true remedy for saving both time, labour, and expense. It consisted in having a Joint Committee of the two Houses, seven Commoners and five Peers, the Duke at first was for six of each, but with his wonted sagacity he soon perceived the necessity of giving a majority to the Commons, and with his never-failing candour he assented to this change. The whole matter of each Bill, both law and fact, were to be referred to this Committee, with a professional Judge to assist and inform it on questions of law and evidence, but in no way to guide or control. The Report made to each House was to be conclusive only on the facts, leaving the whole question of the Bill to the entire and free decision of each House. Such an improvement in our course of legislation would effectually prevent the enormous labours, delay, and expense of a double inquiry in each case, and although the pains taken by an able and experienced Member of the other House had effected considerable improvements of late, yet he (Lord Brougham) was convinced that this plan thus sanctioned by his illustrious Friend must sooner or later be adopted, as the real and effectual remedy for evils at present so severely felt by all but those interested in the continuance of the evil.

Resolved, That *Wednesday* next be considered as a Sitting Day with respect to any Petition praying to be heard upon the Merits against any Bill mentioned in either of the Two Classes of Private Bills.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Order No. 178. Sect. 9. *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with* for the Remainder of the Session.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

STANDING ORDER No. 25 AMENDED.

Standing Order No. 25. Sect. 2. *considered* (according to Order), and amended as follows: After the Words ("to be kept on the Table for that Purpose") add ("and the Tellers shall be appointed"); and after the Words ("as indicated by the Sand Glass") add ("or after such shorter Time as the Tellers appointed on both Sides may agree to.")—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

PRISONS BILL—(No. 155.)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 68 (Prohibition of Sentence of Solitary Confinement).

THE EARL OF CARNARVON *moved* the omission of the clause. The Select Committee of their Lordships' House, which had inquired very fully into this subject, had expressed an opinion in favour of this punishment, as being very valuable, especially in cases of short sentences. The clause formed no part of the Bill as it emanated from the Home Office, but was inserted in the Bill in the other House. The abolition of this punishment had no connection with the subject-matter of the Bill, which was for the regulation of the administration of prisons. The abolition of the punishment of solitary confinement was a matter of judicial procedure, which ought not to be imported into a Bill of this sort. The Bill did not apply to military prisons, and military tribunals, as their Lordships were aware, were frequently in the habit of imposing sentences of three and six months' imprisonment, with solitary confinement for one week in every month. How was it possible that such a sentence could be carried out if this clause were passed? There were often offences committed in prison which required to be dealt with by means of solitary confinement, and if the justices were deprived of this power they would be unable to deal with them. He hoped, therefore, that the noble Lord (Earl Granville) would agree to the omission of this clause.

EARL GRANVILLE said, the noble Earl was quite right in saying that the clause formed no part of the Bill as it left the Home Office, but he could not agree that it was an anomaly in a Bill of this character. The clause, he believed, had been unanimously agreed to by the Select Committee of the other House, and he hoped their Lordships would agree to retain it in the Bill.

LORD HOUGHTON thought the clause went beyond the scope of the Bill. No doubt very exaggerated ideas were entertained at one time of the effects of solitary confinement; but still, for certain purposes, it was a useful punishment, and Her Majesty's Government would do well to omit the clause.

The Marquess of SALISBURY and The Earl of ROMNEY urged the omission of the clause.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that in deference to the opinion of the noble Lords he would consent to strike out the clause.

Clause *struck out.*

THE EARL OF CARNARVON *moved* an Amendment to Schedule I., Rule 34, which he said was rendered necessary by the omission of Clause 68. It was admitted that where hard labour in any form was imposed low diet could not be inflicted. The object was to make the punishment in cases of short sentences sharp and severe, and therefore that object would be defeated if hard labour were imposed, thus rendering it impossible to give the prisoner a low diet. He therefore moved to omit certain words from the clause which would prevent the addition of hard labour in short sentences.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Schedule II. (List of Gaols to be closed.)

THE EARL OF CARNARVON desired to be informed why the gaol at Poole was not included within its operation. The Committee ascertained that the average number of prisoners in that gaol was only two, and the maximum number in the course of the year only eleven. The food of the prisoners was not cooked in the gaol in the usual manner, but there was a contract with a neighbouring hotel, and the dinners of the inmates were brought in upon trays by the servants of that establishment. Several prisoners were allowed to sleep in one cell, and he was not sure that two had not been permitted to occupy the same bed. The tread-mill was so constructed that one prisoner could turn the wheel; and when the governor went out he was compelled to lock up the one or two prisoners who might be in the gaol, and trust to their own industry for the performance of the tasks imposed upon them.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that he did not know why this gaol had been left out of the schedule, but he was sure that there must be some good reason for its omission. He would inquire into the subject, and would answer the noble Earl's question upon a future day.

Schedule *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 228.)

GREENWICH HOSPITAL BILL—(No. 179.)

SECOND READING.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said, it was founded on the Report of a Royal Commission. Having pointed out the principal clauses of the Bill, the noble Duke said, that as there was no objection to the general principle of the Bill, he should content himself with moving that it be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Duke of Somerset.*)

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE said, that it had been repeatedly represented that after the passing of this Bill the Hospital would remain very much as it was before. It appeared to him, however, that the Bill proposed to substitute in lieu of the present Hospital a fund which should be entirely at the disposal of the Admiralty, which was to have the complete and entire control of the revenues of the Hospital, and to have the appointment of the pensioners. The Bill, therefore, must be regarded as entirely abolishing Greenwich Hospital as it was generally understood, and to hand over its revenues to purposes quite foreign to the purpose for which it was founded — namely, that of being a great almshouse for the reception of aged and wounded seamen. It now seemed to be the desire of the Admiralty to get rid of the pensioners altogether. The noble Duke had entirely changed his opinion on this subject since last year, when he expressed a strong opinion that the building should be retained for the purposes to which it had been so long applied, and that the revenues should be kept distinct; whereas, the Bill proposed not only to take away the building from the seamen, but also to place the revenues in the hands of the Admiralty, who would have to create a new office for its management at a great annual expense. Now, he might be asked what arrangement he was prepared to advise? He replied that the revenues could be better managed if a Commissioner were placed over them, whose accounts would be audited and submitted to Parliament. The management of the property of the value of £200,000 a year would require a certain number of clerks at the Admiralty, and constitute an *imperium in imperio*, while the Admiralty had quite enough to do in governing the navy. And yet the estates would not be managed as efficiently as if they were under a Commissioner with a steward in charge of them. He (the Earl of Hardwicke) would keep the Hospital for the unmarried seamen, and with regard to the married men, he would give them pensions outside. If the Hospital was not then sufficiently filled he would reserve a part for the cure of diseased and wounded men, and in time of war it would again revert to its ancient purpose. The officers at present in the Hospital he would have liberally compensated, and he would have placed the three captains on the list of retired Admirals. There were two remarkable instances of such, as both Captains Cook and Lord Rodney had been on the Greenwich Hospital list, and afterwards returned to active service. He deeply regretted the step taken by the Admiralty.

The Earl of COLCHESTER expressed his opinion that the Bill would not work so well as the Government expected.

The Duke of SOMERSET, in reply to the observations of the noble Earl (the Earl of Hardwicke), said, that the Bill was only what had been shadowed out in a memorandum which he had laid upon the table some time ago, and which he believed had met with the general approbation of both Houses of Parliament. Pensioners who were not quite worn out felt that a residence in Greenwich Hospital was a monotonous sort of existence—a kind of monastic life—and, no doubt, very many of them would gladly avail themselves of the permission to go out and live with their friends.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

SALMON FISHERY ACT (1861) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 199.)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee read.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that though he had several Amendments to propose on this Bill, he had no wish to oppose its passing. He was desirous that the salmon fisheries should be protected and improved, but not at the expense of private rights, and he hoped that in revising the Bill their Lordships would remember that two years ago they had rather hastily taken upon themselves to decide several points in opposition to the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, three ex-Chancellors, another noble and learned Lord, and the two noble Earls who led the two sides of the House. The consequence was that a noble Lord who had been very zealous for the Bill came down the other night conscience-stricken and admitted that the Bill had been a failure; that it had committed great injustice, and that it must be remedied, if justice was to be expected from that House. He hoped that their Lordships in considering the Bill would not be carried away by a *salmomania.*

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 13, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (*Ex-officio* Members of Board).

The Earl of MALMESBURY proposed an Amendment, providing that no person should be a conservator who was not the owner or occupier of fifty acres of land abutting on the stream within the limits of the fishery district.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY objected to restricting the discretion of the magistrates in the selection of these officers.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 15 to 30, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 31 (Order for Entry of Water-Bailiff on Land).

The Earl of MALMESBURY objected to the extraordinary powers conferred upon watchers to enter upon premises and to remain there for three days and nights, and therefore moved the omission of the clause.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, the clause was only an extension of a clause in the Irish Salmon Fishery Act.

Lord CHELMSFORD suggested that the clause should apply to premises not being a dwelling-house or garden.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY agreed to the Amendment.

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Clauses 32 to 39, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 40 (Commissioners to inquire as to fixed Engines).

Lord CHELMSFORD said, that the clause gave to the Commissioners unusual and arbitrary powers, and moved that it be omitted from the Bill.

On Question, that the said Clause stand Part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 13; Not-Contents 7: Majority 6.

Amendments made; The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 229.)

CONTENTS.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Somerset, D.

Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Granville, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Llanover, L.
Lovat, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L. [*Teller.*]
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Malmesbury, E. [*Teller.*]	Denman, L.
	Monteagle of Brandon L.
	Redesdale, L.
Chelmsford, L. [*Teller.*]	Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Cranworth, L.	

ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH asked the Lord President of the Council, If his Lordship is aware that Mr. J. D. Morell, late one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Roman Catholic schools, who was dismissed from that Office on the 4th day of March, 1864, has been appointed as Inspector of Roman Catholic schools by the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund with the sanction of the Committee of the Council of Education?

EARL GRANVILLE said, that he had made inquiries on the subject, and it appeared that Mr. Morell was appointed by the Commissioners of the Royal Patriotic Fund previous to his dismissal from his office of Inspector of Roman Catholic Schools.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH wished to know whether the noble Earl thought that the appointment should be sanctioned by the Government?

EARL GRANVILLE said, that the Government had no voice in the matter.

LIVERPOOL BOROUGH PRISON.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether it has authorized a Curtain to be drawn over the Ten Commandments in the Chapel of the Liverpool Borough Prison, so as completely to obscure them from Observation while the Romish so-called Altar is therein displayed and the Roman Priest performs his services therein?

EARL GRANVILLE said, that this was a matter for the justices of Liverpool to decide. No authority had been asked for and none had been given by the Home Office in the matter.

HYMN BOOK FOR THE ARMY AND NAVY.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH inquired, Whether the Hymn Book entitled, *Hymns Ancient and Modern, for use in the Services of the Church*, has been adopted as the authorized Hymn Book for Her Majesty's Army and Navy? He understood that the Hymn Book in question had been issued to the army and navy, with orders that no other work of the kind should be used for the service, and that it was bound up with the Prayer Books furnished to our soldiers. The noble Marquess quoted various passages from the hymns to show that they were either derived from or founded upon the Roman Catholic breviaries and missals, and maintained that their language was inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England, and countenanced doctrines which the Articles of that Church expressly denounced as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." He complained of the insidious manner in which these doctrines were being introduced into the army and navy, and asked whether it was true that that Hymn Book had been inflicted on our soldiers and sailors.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, the noble Marquess was correct in supposing that a selection of hymns from the book called *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, had been made for the use of the army, and had been bound up with the Prayer Book as he had stated. These Hymns had also been issued to the navy. With respect to the book itself, he had not been able to follow the noble Marquess in the extracts he had read, and was therefore unable to say whether or not those particular hymns were included in the selection; neither could he enter upon any theological discussion of the subject; but the admitted fact that these hymns had been recommended by the dignitaries of the Church, and were used in a thousand parishes in this country, was the best guarantee they could have that they contained nothing inconsistent with the received doctrines of the Church of England. The old hymns of Tate and Brady had become distasteful to the soldiers and sailors, and it was thought desirable to provide some new ones. These had been adopted with the approval of the Chaplain General of the Army and of a Committee of naval chaplains and officers. The noble Marquess complained that portions of these hymns were taken from the Roman Catholic books of worship; but he surely was aware that large portions of the Book of Common Prayer was taken from the ancient Liturgies, and that the *Te Deum*, for instance, was similarly derived. That there was nothing in this Hymn Book contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, the character of the noble Duke at the head of the Admiralty (the Duke of Somerset) was a guarantee. He would not enter into a theological discussion with the noble Marquess, but he was content to rest his defence of the course taken in regard to this question upon the approval of a body of men who understood such subjects better than he or the noble Marquess—namely, the great dignitaries of the Church and the clergymen of a thousand parishes.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH said, he was much obliged to the noble Earl for his candour, but must say that, while certain parts of our Prayer Book were no doubt taken from the Church of Rome, as, for example, the *Te Deum*—than which nothing could be more magnificent—yet nothing had been borrowed from that source which the Church of England expressly declared to be incompatible with her own principles.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Nine o'clock, till To-morrow,
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 27, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Committee*—Marriages (Lambourne) * [*Lords*] [237].
Report—Marriages (Lambourne) * [*Lords*] [237].
Considered as amended— Clerical Subscription [*Lords*] [199]; Turnpike Acts Continuance * [227]; Colonial Docks Loans * [226].
Third Reading—County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction * [*Lords*] [236]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [235]; Poor Law Board Continuance, &c. * [238].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

COURT OF REFEREES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

STANDING ORDERS.

Standing Order 88 read.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN in rising, pursuant to notice, to call attention to the Report of the Committee on the Court of Referees on Private Bills, said, that before he adverted to the alterations in the Standing Orders which he was about to propose, he wished to say a few words on the Private Business of the House, not only in its present state, but as it had existed for some years past. The attention of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair had been directed to the subject for several years past; but many hon. Members might not recollect the period when the introduction of railways so greatly increased the Private Business of the House, that it was found necessary to abandon the old system of district Committees, no longer adequate to deal with the Railway Bills, and to substitute Committees of five for each Bill. That was a most important change, and one which gave satisfaction to the public. But business continued to increase so much that it was soon found impossible to transact it without appointing so many Committees that the Parliamentary Bar made complaints of their inability to discharge their duties to their clients. It was also found that so much variety of opinion and such conflicting decisions were arrived at by Committees that it was impossible for parties applying for Bills to form a judgment in regard to the result of the inquiry. These difficulties led to another alteration—the formation of the Chairman's Panel of seven or eight Members, who acted as Chairmen of all the Committees to which the railway business of the Session was referred; railways were grouped into districts, and the number of tribunals was thus greatly reduced. This was a great improvement. Greater uniformity was obtained, and the length of the proceedings on Private Bills was curtailed. This system, however, now failed to meet the requirements of the day. If hon. Members would look at the Votes they would find that in no one Session for some time past had either House of Parliament been able to transact the Private Business in a proper manner. Its increase in the meanwhile so largely added to the duties of Members that complaints were continually made and hopes expressed that some other mode of transacting it might be devised. The present Session was not altogether a fair illustration, but he would remind hon. Members that a few days since he had brought under the notice of the House the fact that there stood on the notice paper not less than sixteen Notices of Motion by the hon. Member for Walsall (Mr. Charles Forster) for suspending the Standing Orders as the only means by which the business of the one House might be properly transmitted to the other. During the last eight days not less than fifty-five Motions of that kind had been made. On that very day there were five or six Motions of a similar kind—making sixty Notices of Motion within nine days to suspend the Stand ing Orders. These Orders had been enacted for public objects and for the protection of private and public interests. If they were of no importance, let them be wiped off at once; but, if otherwise, it was inconsistent with the order and regularity of their proceedings that they should be suspended sixty times within nine days. Several Committees had been appointed from time to time to consider this subject, and on all hands, without exception, a common complaint was heard that the system of transacting the Private Business of the House did not work satisfactorily. Last Session several Members met together to consider what improvements might be made. Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie), and several others were present, and offered suggestions. He (Colonel Wilson Patten) had suggested that at least time might be saved to Members by detaching from the inquiry before Committee all that part of the business that did not relate to legislative merits, but to the engineering and other statistical details. The subject was afterwards referred to a Select Committee, which recommended that a trial should be made of the suggestion which he had the honour to make; and the House ratified the recommendation of the Committee. Having had the experience of one Session the House was now in a position to determine whether, on the whole, the advantages gained by the appointment of the Court of Referees were such as to induce it to continue the system for another Session, or for good. He would now tell the House the result of the inquiry of its Select Committee. The Committee proposed to themselves three heads of inquiry. The first was, had there been a saving of time to Members of the House? Secondly, if there had been such saving of time, had there been a saving of expense, or, if not, what increase of expense to the parties had occurred? Thirdly, had the new system tended on the whole to expedite the Private Business of the House? The Committee called before them several witnesses best calculated to give a sound opinion on the matters at issue; but with regard to the Bar, he (Colonel Wilson Patten) did not select a single witness. He requested that at least two barristers who were most opposed in principle to the Court of Referees might be deputed to give evidence. He did the same by the Parliamentary agents. He also endeavoured to ascertain the opinion of the Chairmen of Select Committees in regard to the saving of time by hon. Members serving on Committees. The following Members of the Parliamentary Bar were examined by the Committee:—Mr. Phinn, Mr. Davison, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Vernon Harcourt. Mr. Phinn was unfavourable to the new system; he doubted whether it had either saved expense to the parties or the time of the House. It appeared, however, that Mr. Phinn had not only included the time spent by hon. Members, but also the time during which the Referees had been occupied. Mr. Davison doubted whether there had been a saving of time, yet thought that one branch of the inquiry, the *locus standi*, was better dealt with before the Referees than the Committees. Mr. Coleridge was of opinion that there had been a saving both of time and expense. Mr. Rodwell expressed a similar opinion, and was in favour of the Court of Referees. Mr. Vernon Harcourt was adverse to the principle of the double inquiry, but, in justice to the Court of Referees, he (Colonel Wilson Patten) should like to read to the House a portion of the evidence given by this gentleman. Being asked his opinion upon the results of the Court of Referees during the present Session, he said—

> "I should wish, in the first instance, to say that it is impossible to express too strongly my opinion of the extraordinary work which has been done by the Referees in the course of this Session, both in respect of the stupendous industry which they have shown, and the great ability which has been brought to bear upon the questions with which they have dealt. All I have to say is, that if you could find a sufficient number of persons to constitute Committees, as efficient as the Courts of Referees, the whole system would be superfluous, because I do not suppose that anybody would think of removing from a body so constituted the consideration of the whole of the question which is to be decided. I have been before the Referees in cases of the greatest possible consequence, and the only feeling which I have had is one of regret that, after gentlemen of such competence to deal with the question have gone into the inquiry in a most elaborate manner, just at the moment when the matter is ripe for a final decision, it should be withdrawn from them and carried before another tribunal, which has, necessarily, a much less acquaintance with the question upon which it has to pronounce."

The Parliamentary agents examined were Mr. Coates, Mr. Venables, and Mr. Gregory. Mr. Coates doubted whether time had been saved, and pointed out instances in which the new system had caused unnecessary delay and increased expense. Mr. Venables was in favour of the new system in all respects, and hoped it would not be given up. Mr. Gregory preferred a system of his own, but thought that the new system led to a saving of time. The only engineer examined was Mr. Harrison, who suggested a mode by which estimates might be put forward in greater detail at the commencement of the Session. His hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Adair) had given notice of a Motion for carrying that suggestion into effect. The Committee also had the evidence of the Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Dodson). He had given the subject his impartial consideration, and he was in favour of a further trial of the new court. The hon. Member for Knaresborough (Mr. Woodd) and the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. A. Mills) were also examined, and they were on the whole favourable. The former was of opinion that the labours of Members in private Committees had been materially shortened by the Referees; and the latter was of the same opinion, but thought that further improvements might be made. The result was that it appeared to the Committee desirable to continue the present system, subject to such modifications as he had given notice of. There was a Standing Order limiting the number of counsel before the Court of Referees to one. Complaints were made by Mr. Phinn, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, and Mr. Coates against that restriction. On the other hand, evidence was given that in the generality of cases the rule was beneficial. There were only three or four cases in which an inquiry occupied more than one day, and the Committee came to the conclusion that the existing rule should be adhered to, but that the Referees should have the power of admitting more than one counsel if they thought fit, on the application of the parties. Another suggestion was, that where the Referees decided that the estimates were insufficient, the Bill was not to be proceeded with except by Order of the House. The Committee held this to be a good rule, as tending to insure a stricter performance of the requirements of the House, and that the estimates and the engineering details should come before the House in a more perfect state than they had hitherto done. A few Sessions ago the leading members of the Bar complained of the shortness of the sittings of private Committees, which nominally met at twelve and adjourned at four; but the average duration of each sitting was practically about three hours and a half. With a view to remedy this defect the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Adair) proposed that all the Committees over which he presided should meet at eleven instead of twelve. The right hon. Member for Durham (Mr. Mowbray) also endeavoured to carry this change into effect, but it was found impossible to obtain the concurrence of Members generally; and this was not surprising. To be in the Committee-room at eleven, a Member must leave his house about half-past ten. This allowed a totally inadequate interval for a due attention to his duties to his constituents, to say nothing of his correspondence and private affairs. At four o'clock he had to perform his duties in the House, which sat from that hour to twelve and one o'clock, and sometimes later. He thought, therefore, that this alteration ought not to be forced on Members. Every witness before the Committee spoke in favour of two points—the taking away the decision of *locus standi* from private Committees and giving it to a separate tribunal. The Court of Referees had sat on an average six hours a day, and one witness stated that they did more in six hours than would be done in a sitting of two days before a Committee of that House. Under these circumstances it was for the House to determine whether they would adhere to the recommendation of the Committee—namely, that, with certain alterations, the Court of Referees should be continued to another Session. The Committee believed that many of the defects of the new system might be met by the experience acquired in its working. No doubt the system of double inquiry was open to objection; but on the whole the Committee were, he thought, justified in the conclusion to which they came, that there had been a great saving of time to Members. There had been an increase of expense, no doubt, to certain parties, but on the whole it was clear that a saving of expense had been effected, and that the expedition with which the Private Business of the Session had been transacted had been much greater than if it had been referred entirely to Select Committees of the House. The Committee were of opinion that when the Court of Referees had discharged their duties under the Standing Orders with reference to estimates and statistics, they should inquire into the whole case, with the consent of the parties, and report to the House, and that when the

Referees agreed that a Bill should be proceeded with, it should be referred to the Chairman of Ways and Means, and treated as an unopposed Bill. He thought that, without infringing upon the constitutional rule of the House, some further time might be saved by adopting this rule. He was convinced that the House had done wisely in keeping the Private Business within its own jurisdiction. He believed that the Private Business was on the whole well conducted by the House, but that the time was coming when it must be still more seriously considered by both Houses of Parliament. Every one knew the dilemma in which the Legislature was placed at the present moment. Parliament had been sitting for five months, and now, at the end of June and on the eve of a dissolution, he believed there were forty Bills before the other House which their Lordships had not yet had time to consider. One great advantage of the new Court he had omitted to state—namely, their lengthened sittings. Two Members of that House—the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Hassard) and the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Adair) had by a sacrifice of time, which the public could scarcely sufficiently appreciate, devoted themselves in a manner beyond all praise to the duty of presiding over the Courts of Referees. He begged to thank also his right hon. Friend in the Chair for the selection he had made in the members of the Court of Referees, which had given satisfaction to every one. He had not heard a single doubt or criticism in regard to the Gentlemen selected to sit upon these Courts. They had been selected by the Speaker without regard to party or to any other consideration, except the best mode of transacting the business of the House. The Select Committee having seen that the Chairman of the Court of Referees had given up their time from the very beginning of the Session to the discharge of their onerous duties, thought it was not fair to ask them to continue their services without compensation. He (Colonel Wilson Patten) was in the first instance opposed to the payment of Members of that House for the services in question; but he saw no other way of meeting the difficulty, and he was now prepared to waive every objection to the payment of the two Chairmen who presided over the Court of Referees. He must now apologize to the House for having taken this matter up. The management of the Private Business of that House was really in the hands of his hon. Friend the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means (Mr. Dodson). He looked upon himself as acting under his hon. Friend and it had been with some reluctance, and only because he had for many years filled an office which made him more immediately acquainted with the services of Members on Private Committees, and their grievances, that he had put himself forward on the present occasion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Standing Order be repealed."—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

Mr. AYRTON objected to the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire as an important change in the constitution of the House, and as contrary to the solemn assurance given by the late Chairman of Ways and Means that the new system should be so carried out that the House should never be reduced to the position of paying its Members. But by this proposal the Speaker was enabled to convert any two Members into his own stipendiary officers. He must also say that the House was not in the position to consider a change of so much importance, inasmuch as it must itself soon cease to exist. One of the greatest evils of the present system of conducting the Private business of the House arose from the fact that there were none of those legal rules of procedure which, in his opinion, were necessary to enable a Court to arrive at a proper judicial conclusion. It would certainly be an improvement to separate the question of *locus standi* from the trial of the cause, and to that extent he entirely acquiesced in what had been done; but after that preliminary point had been disposed of he could not understand upon what principle there should be two Courts to hear each case.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he could not believe it to be fair to call upon two Members of the House to devote the whole of their time to expediting the Private business, and to make great sacrifices of their own affairs without awarding them some adequate compensation—it was another question whether, at the close of a Parliament, and in a very thin House, hon. Members should be asked to come to a decision upon so important a question as whether they should be paid. Possibly it might be well to leave it over to a future occasion. He entirely acquiesced in the decision of the

Committee, and he thought that the Court of Referees might be allowed in many cases to give an opinion upon the question of expediency as well as of fact.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he quite agreed with the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets that the question of paying Members was one which ought to be maturely considered before the House came to any decision, but he had no hesitation in saying if the system was to be continued it was a question which ought to be faced, for it was impossible that any Gentlemen should be expected to give their continuous attention to the business of Committees without some remuneration. The tribunal was, from the nature of its constitution, a weak one, and it was necessary to consider whether it could not be improved. With regard to the important question, how far the system had inspired public confidence, he felt a strong conviction that it had done so to a considerable extent, and that if it was continued it would maintain its position in that respect. A suggestion had been made that when a question was before the Referees they should be at liberty to inquire into the whole matter. He was convinced that the success which had hitherto attended the working of the new plan arose from the Gentlemen who acted as Chairmen and their assessors giving their continuous and undivided attention to the business, and he was of opinion that if questions were to be wholly decided by the Referees, there would be a great saving of time and expense, and greater equity in the ultimate decision. The work spread over a great number of Committees might be concentrated in two or three tribunals, and he thought it desirable that power might be given to Committees to sit when the House was not sitting. Two or three tribunals sitting continuously would, he believed, be able to dispose of the whole of the Private business in a satisfactory manner; but then the House must be prepared to give an adequate remuneration to the Gentlemen who gave up their whole time and experience to the work.

Lord HOTHAM desired to point out that if the settlement of this matter were left over to the new Parliament a considerable portion of the Session would be lost for the transaction of Private business. He concurred in wishing to continue the system, so that the House might give it a fair trial, which it had not yet had. While the House had had an unusually large number of Private Bills to deal with, it had had an unusually brief period to dispose of them. There might be forty Bills yet to be disposed of, but these would be got through without inconvenience if Parliament sat until the usual period of the year. He felt confident that his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Wilson Patten) had fairly quoted the evidence of witnesses before the Committee, yet it was contrary to the practice of the House to come to a decision on the very day that the evidence was laid before them. He had always entertained the greatest objection to the introduction of a system under which Members of the House were to be paid for their services, and he should reserve his judgment on the point until a Motion for the payment of the Chairmen of the Court of Referees should be formally made.

Mr. HENLEY said, he did not think the House ought to tie themselves or those who might come after them in the new Parliament to the great changes which were indicated in the proposal submitted to the House by the hon. and gallant Member. He was perfectly willing to consent to the pure and simple continuance of the Court of Referees, for he was not only willing but desirous to give the present system another fair trial. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman had given notice of important alterations in the system introduced this Session. It was not two Chairmen alone who might be appointed. The Resolution referred to an unlimited number, and it appeared to be the necessary consequence of agreeing to it that the Chairmen should be paid. The House, in its present condition, ought to pause before it acceded to so grave a proposition. No one would undervalue the labours of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford (Mr. Hassard) or the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Adair); but directly they opened the door to the payment of Members they did not know where the thing might stop. The three principal questions referred to the Court of Referees were the estimates, the engineering details, and the *locus standi.* But, according to the plan sketched out by the hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire, every other issue that the parties could agree to submit to them was to be decided by the Court. The opponents and promoters of a Bill were usually the only parties before a Committee, and in this new scheme he did not see who were to take care of the public. If the Court of Referees agreed to the Bill, it was to go before the Chairman of Ways and Means. But suppose he said the preamble was not proved? The Bill would then come to be debated on the floor of the House. The House had not yet seen the evidence taken before the Select Committee, and they ought to have an opportunity of considering the subject fully before coming to so important a conclusion. He trusted the House would not be called upon to express any opinion beyond that of simply saying that the system should be continued.

Mr. DODSON said, that the House must have felt that no apology was needed from his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Wilson Patten) for undertaking to bring this subject before the House. The appointment of the Court of Referees had proved successful beyond all his expectations. He had deemed it open to the fundamental objection of a divided jurisdiction. That was still his opinion. He had also doubted whether it would practically work; but herein he had been mistaken. It had worked on the whole well, and had effected a great improvement on the former state of things. The effect had been to expedite business, to save time and labour to Members of that House, and at the same time the questions of engineering and estimates, which were the special subjects of consideration before the Referees, had been sifted and investigated in a manner never before performed. He thought that the Courts of Referees might be composed of Members of the House assisted by permanent assessors, and should then have the same power as ordinary Committees of dealing with Private Bills, and reporting upon them; but as the Committee had recommended that the system should be continued as it had hitherto been conducted he hoped the House would consent to the Resolution—which proposed that where all parties are agreed the Referees shall have power to inquire into the whole subject matter of the Bill and report to the House; the Bill thereafter to be treated as an unopposed Bill. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) asked who were to represent the public, but the public would not be in a worse position than if the Bill went before a Select Committee. He did not see how the interests of the public would be in the least degree endangered if the whole question went before the Referees. With regard to the payment of the Chairmen, it was not in reason to be expected that the present system could be continued for another Session unless the House were prepared to remunerate Members who devoted the whole of their time to the duties. The payment of these gentlemen was almost a *sine quâ non* of the continuance of the system, for he did not believe the House would find gentlemen who would permanently undertake these duties another Session without payment. Their duties had been very great and serious. The Courts had been sitting at the rate of six hours a day, and then the Chairman had, in addition, the labour of framing their reports in the evening to be laid before the House the next day. It was said an expiring Parliament should not deal with so important a question, and this appeared to be one of the principal objections felt to the repeal of the Standing Order before them; but there was always a great deal of pressure at the beginning of a Session, and if the House could not start with the Private Business at once there was the greatest possible difficulty in getting through with it. The duty of the present Parliament, as it seemed to him, if they thought the new system of Private Business worked well, was to bequeath it to the next Parliament with every facility to enable that Parliament to take up and continue the experiment. He could not believe that the present House of Commons would be exceeding its limits if it handed down the present system with such alterations and improvements as experience had suggested. If the present Parliament rescinded the prohibition of the payment of Chairmen of the Courts it would not preclude the next Parliament from dealing as it thought fit with the question of remuneration. No remuneration would be granted except by a Vote of the House, when the whole question would be discussed. He trusted that the House would agree to the repeal of the Standing Order now proposed.

Mr. MOWBRAY thought that the speech of the hon. Gentleman, the Chairman of Ways and Means, had disclosed the greatest possible objection to the proposal now made, for he said that the payment of the Chairmen was a *sine quâ non* of obtaining the services of competent gentlemen to act in that capacity. The answer was, first, that such a question should not be brought before Parliament without distinct notice.

The blue-book was only delivered at ten that morning, and at twelve o'clock the House was invited to weigh the evidence and decide upon the recommendations of the Committee. An important question affecting Members of that House was now raised—namely, whether their attention was to be withdrawn from the consideration of the national, imperial, and political questions intrusted to them, and to be entirely occupied with the details connected with Private Bills. Another objection was, that the present Motion raised the question of the payment of these hon. Members in the most indirect manner, and without the least notice. He did not wish to prejudge the question, but he entertained the strongest objection to the payment of Members for services rendered in that House. A belief prevailed in the minds of some people that Members of Committees on Private Bills received ten guineas a day for their attendance. The reply had always been that, with the exception of the Speaker and the Chairman of Ways and Means, no Member of that House received any remuneration for the discharge of the Private Business of the House. If they once began to remunerate Members where was it to stop? If the Referees were to be paid would not the Chairmen of Committees on Private Bills expect remuneration? If their claims were admitted how long could they expect Chairmen of Select Committees, who sat day by day for several weeks of the Session, to serve without payment? If the House agreed to this Resolution, the Government would feel compelled in the next Session of Parliament to propose a Vote for the payment of these Chairmen. The next Parliament ought not to find the question thus settled for it, and he trusted that his hon. and gallant Friend would not press his Motion.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, the House must see that his hon. and gallant Friend, having moved for the appointment of the Committee to inquire into the working of the new system, could not do otherwise than bring under its notice the recommendations of the Committee, and to propose such Standing Orders as they deem desirable. It was, however, obvious that, if they went beyond a mere Continuance Bill, there ought to be something like a general concurrence of opinion in any change that might be made. It was difficult to answer the appeal that the evidence had only just been laid before the House. Late, however, as the period of the Session was, it became the duty of the House to signify to the public what kind of tribunal would next Session begin the consideration of Private Bills—the present House of Commons ought to leave some directions to the future Parliament; but he would suggest to his hon. and gallant Friend that he would do well either to withdraw his Motion and move it again on Monday or agree to the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, it would not be desirable to withdraw his Motion, and have his speech to make over again, but he would not object to the adjournment of the debate. At the same time he wished to remind the House that at present there was no proposition made by the Committee to pay the Chairman. He only asked the House to try the plan proposed by the Committee as an experiment, and let it be for future consideration whether it should be made permanent or not. All he desired was that these Resolutions should be a continuance of the experiment which had already been tried, subject to the improvements suggested by the Committee. He had no objection to postpone the consideration of the question until Monday, although he could not see what satisfactory object could be attained by a postponement.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, it was natural the House should wish to examine the evidence before it came to a decision, and it was only with that object his right hon. Friend had moved the adjournment of the debate. No doubt the passing of the Motion now before the House would be regarded as an expression of opinion that the Chairmen ought to be paid, and would pledge the Government to propose the Vote in the next Session of Parliament. He would not express any opinion whether such payment would be advisable or not, but the House ought to know the evidence on which the Committee found their recommendation.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that in spite of their utmost exertions it had been found impossible to get the evidence printed and in the hands of Members before that morning.

Viscount CRANBOURNE agreed that it was undesirable to come to a vote on the question until the evidence had been considered. Still the House would do well not to form an opinion too rashly against the payment of these two gentlemen, or without considering the enormous amount of business performed by them.

Sir JOHN SHELLEY, in voting for the further trial of the experiment, distinctly understood that the two hon. Gentlemen referred to would not continue their labours next Session unless they were paid. In recommending the continuance of the system next Session, therefore, the Committee regarded the payment of the Chairmen of the Courts of Referees as a *sine quâ non*. The work they had been called upon to perform had been truly described as enormous.

Mr. LYGON said, that if there was a general concurrence of opinion that the experiment ought to be continued, he did not see how the House could postpone the question of the payment of the Chairmen until next Session.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that if the House rejected the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend it would be understood that it was opposed to any payment being made. Now, he had been as unwilling as any one to begin a proceeding of that kind, but he had come to the deliberate conclusion that if they insisted on the Chairmen being Members of the House, they would be unable to carry on the present system unless they paid them. He suggested that the House might amend the Standing Orders with the exception of No. 88, and leave the question of remuneration to the Chairmen to be dealt with next Session.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN thought it probable that if the debate was adjourned to Monday there would be a still smaller House than at present.

Mr. MOWBRAY suggested, that instead of adjourning the debate it would be better to let any alteration in Standing Order No. 88 remain over for consideration till next Session.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN consented to withdraw the proposition for the payment of the Chairmen of the Court of Referees, on condition that the other recommendations of the Committee, to which he did not think there could be any objection were agreed to.

Viscount CRANBOURNE regretted that his hon. and gallant Friend had yielded himself in this way into the hands of the enemy. Another discussion on this subject two or three days hence would have done a great deal of good. The argument that if they paid the Chairmen of these Courts they could not refuse to pay Chairmen of all other Committees was a hobgoblin argument of the purest breed. A superstition more utterly baseless never interfered with a practical, sensible, business-like proposal. He was sure that the salary paid to these gentlemen would not exceed the value of the services they had rendered. The only Member who was paid, except the Speaker, was the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means; and if the payment of Members proceeded in the ratio of past progression, the House would arrive at the fifth "point of the charter"—the payment of Members—in about 10,000 years. It was calculated that the new Parliament would be composed to the extent of about one-third new Members, who would have had no experience of the conscription exercised by his hon. and gallant Friend, or the evils and inconvenience of the present system of private business. Surely a Parliament that had had experience was fitter to deal with this subject than a Parliament that had none. He trusted that his hon. and gallant Friend would lose no time, but that in the very first week of the new Session he would introduce the question on which he had now unfortunately given way.

Motion and Original Question, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Standing Order 89 read, and amended.

Standing Order 90 read, and amended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to offer my personal thanks to those Gentlemen who were so good as to take upon themselves the duties of the Court of Referees at my request. I wish to mention the names of the Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Dodson); Mr. Hugh Adair, Chairman of Court of Referees; Mr. Hassard, Chairman; Mr. Rickards, Counsel to the Speaker; the right hon. Sir W. Gibson Craig, Sir John Duckworth, Colonel Stuart (Bedford), Sir Edward Colebrooke (Lanarkshire), Mr. Leveson Gower (Reigate), and Mr. C. W. Wynne (Montgomeryshire) the last three Gentlemen lending their assistance when the pressure became greatest. By the ability and assiduity which all these Gentlemen brought to bear upon their duties, the Private Business of the House has been performed in a manner satisfactory to the House and to the country.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, that although the House, for the reasons assigned, appeared to be disinclined to consider the payment of the Chairmen of the Court of Referees, both the House, and the public, were deeply indebted to those hon. Gentlemen for the time they had bestowed and the ability with which they had conducted the business of the House.

Resolved, That, in case the Promoters and Opponents of any Bill shall agree that all the questions in issue between them upon such Bill shall be referred to the Referees, it shall be competent to the Referees to inquire into the whole subject matter of the Bill, and to report their opinion thereon to the House; and, in case they shall report that such Bill ought to be proceeded with, the same shall, unless the House shall otherwise order, be referred to the Committee on unopposed Bills, and shall be treated as an unopposed Bill.—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

Standing Order 91 read, and amended.

Resolved, That, in case the Referees shall report, with reference to any Bill, that the Estimate deposited in respect thereof is insufficient, or that the engineering is inefficient for the proposed object, the Bill shall not be further proceeded with unless the House shall otherwise order.—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

Standing Order 149 read, and amended.

Resolved, That the Estimate for any works proposed to be authorized by any Railway, Dock, or Harbour Bill, shall be in the following form, or as near thereto as circumstances may permit:—

ESTIMATE of the proposed (Railway).

Line, No.

	Miles.	*f.*	*ch.*	Whether Single or Double.
Length of Line				

	Cubic yards.	*Price per Ld.*	£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*
Earthworks:				
Cuttings—Rock				
Soft Soil				
Roads				
Total				

Embankments, including Roads .. *Cubic yds.* .. ..
Bridges—Public Roads .. .. *Number* .. ..
Accommodation Bridges and Works .. ..
Viaducts .. ..
Culverts and drains .. ..
Metallings of roads and level crossings .. ..
Gatekeepers' houses at level crossings .. ..
Permanent way, including fencing:

Miles.	*fgs.*	*chs.*		Cost per Mile. £ *s.* *d.*
			at	

Permanent way for sidings, and cost of junctions .. .. ..
Stations .. ..
Contingencies .. .. per cent.
Land and buildings: A. R. P.

Total .. .. £

The same details for each Branch, and General Summary of Total Cost.—(*Mr. Hugh Adair.*)

Resolved, That when a Railway is intended to form a junction with an existing or authorized line of Railway, the course of such existing or authorized line of Railway shall be shown on the deposited plan for a distance of eight hundred yards on either side of the proposed junction, on a scale of not less than four inches to a mile.—(*Mr. Hugh Adair.*)

Resolved, That when a Railway is intended to form a junction with an existing or authorized line of Railway, the gradient of such existing or authorized line of Railway shall be shown on the deposited section, and in connection therewith, and on the same scale as the general section, for a distance of eight hundred yards on either side of the point of junction.—(*Mr. Hugh Adair.*)

Ordered, That the said Resolutions be Standing Orders of the House.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, as amended, be *printed.* [No. 420.]

CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION BILL—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 199.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that the effect of the 12th clause of the Bill would be this, that the oath of canonical obedience would be retained as part of the service for the ordination of priests and the consecration of bishops, whilst the oath giving assent to the articles of religion of the Church of England and the oath of supremacy would not be retained in the service. He could not believe that it was the intention of the framers of the Bill to place a matter of mere discipline in the position of higher importance than a question involving obedience to the Sovereign.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, that the oath of canonical obedience did not rest upon statute, whereas the oath as to assent to the articles of religion and as to the Royal supremacy rested upon the statute law. It was the statutory oath only that was dealt with by this Act, and there was no intention to interfere in any way with the canonical oath of obedience.

Bill to be read 3° *To-morrow.*

LEEDS BANKRUPTCY COURT.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. LONGFIELD: Sir, having given notice of my intention to comment on the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and to ask the Attorney General what steps the Government propose to take against the parties implicated by that Report, I do not know how far I shall be in order in prefacing my Question by a statement of facts. I shall endeavour to compress that statement into as narrow a compass as possible, in order that the House and the country may understand—[Order, order !]

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member intend to conclude with a Motion ?

MR. LONGFIELD: I shall put myself in order by moving, at the conclusion of my statement, the adjournment of the House. ["Oh, oh!"] I am aware that the course is an unusual one, and one which I have never before taken; but the circumstances themselves are so unusual as to afford a complete justification for the step. These circumstances, unhappily, are rather notorious. A Member of Her Majesty's Government, holding the very highest station which can be held under the Crown, has within three months given occasion for two separate inquiries into the purity and propriety of his conduct. The general outline of those inquiries is sufficiently indicated by stating that they bear a considerable resemblance to each other. Having in the course of his judicial functions ascertained that certain offences had been committed, the noble and learned Lord took advantage of those offences to force out of offices which they held the persons by whom it was alleged that those offences were committed, and the proceedings thus instituted on the part of the Crown he made profitable to himself by appointing members of his own family to the vacant offices. One of these investigations took place in the House of Lords, and was connected with a gentleman named Edmunds. That inquiry has a considerable bearing upon the inquiry which has just been concluded by this House; for scarcely had that inquiry terminated when another unfortunate circumstance was adverted to in this House. A gentleman named Wilde was forced to resign his appointment at Leeds, and his appointment was at once promised to the Chancellor's son, although, from circumstances which afterwards occurred, that appointment was not actually made. The matter formed the subject of some discussion in this House, and resulted in the appointment of a Committee to investigate the entire transaction. It was stated that the Chancellor courted the fullest and fairest and openest inquiry; and the Committe of Selection named five Gentlemen of the highest character and respectability to inquire into the circumstances which thus, a second time within two months, cast the deepest possible slur on the administration of justice and on the judicial authority. That Committee, following a most objectionable precedent set in another place, fell, I regret to say, into the very grave mistake—for mistake everybody now confesses it to have been—of conducting that most solemn inquiry, which the Chancellor had declared he desired to be full, free, and open, with closed doors. They concluded their labours rather more than a week ago; their Report, embodying the conclusions at which they have arrived, has been in the hands of Members for the last day or two, and it is now my duty—a painful duty I feel it to be—to bring the subject under the notice of the House, and to ask the Attorney General what steps Her Majesty's Government feel it necessary to take under the circumstances. The persons involved are members of the profession that I was proud of belonging to some little time ago, though certainly, if two or three more transactions of the same kind should take place, I do not know that we may not all have to hang our heads for shame. It was a noble profession, piquing itself justly on its *esprit de corps*, on the high character which its members had always borne, and especially on the reputation of those looked up to and revered as the head of the profession. These investigations, however, tend not only to shake our faith in the administration of justice, but to excite something more than suspicion of corrupt practices. Corrupt practices, at least, have been established, in which the Chancellor's family participated. Let me go through this Report, pausing here and there to interpose an observation connecting the dates, and we shall see how grave this matter has become, and how important it is in the interests of the public that satisfactory explanations should be given by the Government. The Government, I assume, have no object in screening the guilty; they can have no proper political object in screening an offender from justice. There is no motive which should animate a Government that ought to restrain them from meting out to him the same measure of justice which he insisted on meting out to others, untried and unconvicted, who were under his power. I will now come to the commencement of this melancholy, dark, and discreditable transaction. The Lord Chancellor seemed to be a great law reformer, and especially a reformer of bankruptcy proceedings. In 1861 he passed a Bill on that subject, but from that time he slumbered and slept upon the matter. No very lucrative appointments fell to his gift, all the good places had from time to time been filled by his predecessors; and this and the other House disappointed him of the opportunity of appointing the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy which was regarded as the prize of greatest amount in connection with the new system. But in 1864 he awoke from his lethargy, and in very disagreeable mood. He found that everything was going wrong in Bankruptcy, in the courts over which he had jurisdiction, and, among other matters, that there were grievous complaints of the impropriety with which some of the officers in the Leeds Court of Bankruptcy had acted. Paper No. 295, referred to in the Report of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court Committee, contain some documents which give us the first insight into the origin of these transactions. I will trace them date by date, and as we pursue the inquiry we shall see that this nobleman for the second time fell into the unfortunate error of ignoring guilt that he might profit by the guilty. On the 6th of April, 1864—and it is essential to bear these dates in mind—Mr. Miller, the Chief Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy, who was the intimate friend of all the Bethells—of the Hon. Slingsby Bethell, and also of the Hon. Richard Bethell—forwarded a very startling communication to Mr. Wilde, of whose eyes and health we have heard in this House before. The letter was in these terms—

> "Dear Sir—By direction of the Lord Chancellor I lately transmitted to Mr. Commissioner Ayrton the accounts of the official assignees and messengers of the Leeds Court, with a view to an investigation of them, and in a letter dated the 27th ult. Mr. Commissioner Ayrton writes as follows—'I have not yet looked into the accounts of the official assignees, but on opening the large paper returns made to you, I see the words, "Submitted to and approved by Mr. Commissioner Ayrton on the 8th of April, 1862. H. S. Wilde, Registrar."—The fact being that I never saw that sheet or the accounts it refers to, till I received it from you.' I am now directed by the Lord Chancellor to ask what explanation you have to give of this very grave offence."

On the 9th of April Mr. Wilde replied, and his letter drew out a further communication from Mr. Miller, dated the 14th of April, in the course of which Mr. Miller said—

> "Mr. Carrick, one of the official assignees, asserts that you owe him £131, and Mr. Needell, one of the messengers, that you owe him £25, all for money borrowed. I am directed by the Lord Chancellor to ask you whether these statements are true?"

On the 16th of April, by one of those curious coincidences which are found all through this correspondence, Mr. Wilde wrote a reply giving explanations. That brings us to the middle of April, and to the intervention of another gentleman, who, I am sorry to say, is a clergyman—because we must remember that judicial patronage is not the only patronage vested in the Lord Chancellor. The Rev. George Rogers Harding stated, in his evidence before the Committee—

> "That about the end of April, or the beginning of May, 1864, he was at Mr. Bethell's office in Quality Court, and took a letter of introduction from Mr. Bethell to Mr. Welch, who was then in chambers at the Temple; that an arrangement had been previously made that Mr. Bethell should use his influence to procure an appointment from his father in favour of Mr. Welch; that Mr. Welch should pay £500 down, and on obtaining an appointment should pay £1,000 more; that he (Mr. Harding) mentioned this arrangement to Mr. Welch, who acquiesced in it; that the understanding was clear; the £500 was to be paid to Mr. Bethell on the security of his bill at short date, which was to be destroyed or returned if Mr. Welch obtained an appointment, and that he (Mr. Harding), was to receive one-third of the further £1,000, when paid."

Now, that transaction brings us to the end of April, the correspondence of Mr. Wilde and Mr. Miller having closed on the 16th with a letter of explanation from Mr. Wilde, which, for nearly a month afterwards, as he heard nothing more, he had reason to believe was satisfactory. Some discrepancy seems to exist from the Report of the Committee between the evidence of Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch, but there is no dispute on either side that on the 6th of May, 1864, a check was given by Mr. Welch to Mr. Bethell for the sum of £500, as Mr. Harding positively states, there being an arrangement that £500 should be paid down, that £1,000 was to be afterwards paid by Mr. Welch upon obtaining the appointment, and that Mr. Harding was to get a third of it. The bill was at short date, and Mr. Bethell having got the £500 very soon found it desirable to go on the Continent, and nothing more was done just then. Mr. Wilde had sent in an explanation of the charges against him, and that explanation, as I have said, had been received. But some time after the money was obtained by Mr. Bethell, the bill being at short date, Mr. Miller, a friend of the Bethell family, thought it necessary to stir up again the charges which he had allowed before to remain dormant, and on the 16th of May, some ten days after the receipt of the money by Mr. Bethell, he wrote the following letter to Mr. Wilde:—

> "Court of Bankruptcy, May 16, 1864.
>
> "Dear Sir,—By the same post which carries this you will receive copies of four reports lately made to the Lord Chancellor by Mr. Commissioner Ayrton and Mr. Harding on the subject of the returns and accounts of the official assignees and messengers of the Leeds Court, and of the examinations on which these reports proceeded; and I am directed by the Lord Chancellor to request that you will immediately furnish Mr. Commissioner Ayrton with any explanation you may desire to give of the charges against you involved in these documents, and which appear to be:—1. That accounts which ought to have been submitted to and allowed by your Commissioner were certified by you as having been submitted to and sanctioned by him, without his ever having seen such accounts, and that thereby large sums had been improperly allowed to the official assignees. 2. That you have been in the habit of taxing the bills of the messengers without calling for the production of the vouchers for the sums alleged to have been paid by them; and 3. That you had borrowed money both from the official assignees and messengers of the court, and thereby destroyed your independence and efficiency. I must trouble you to acknowledge the receipt of this letter, and of the copies of the reports and examinations.
>
> "Yours, &c.,
>
> "JOHN F. MILLER."
>
> "H. S. Wilde, Esq."

That was ten days after Mr. Bethell had received the cheque, and exactly one month after Miller's letter, in which he said Mr. Carrick had stated he had borrowed the money. For some time nothing further was done. Though the Bill was running on, Mr. Welch did not seem particularly urgent; he relied on the interest which Mr. Bethell had expressed in him, and he probably thought that in a short time the appointment would be made. But having lent the money and having got Mr. Miller as a friend, Mr. Welch soon again solicits the Lord Chancellor for a place. He had paid for it; there was no vacancy, Mr. Wilde having been officially exculpated by the Lord Chancellor, and, curiously enough, contemporaneously with a letter written by Mr. Miller to Mr. Wilde the Lord Chancellor receives a letter from Mr. Welch, soliciting an appointment, and the appointment is made. It will be seen that for some time after the £500 was given by Mr. Welch, little was done, in consequence probably of the absence of Mr. Bethell on the Continent. Until the end of July no letter appears to have been written by Mr. Miller to Mr. Wilde. The next letter of the correspondence is dated the 26th of July. And here, by the way, I may mention that the Committee elicited a most extraordinary circumstance in connection with one of Mr. Miller's letters. The Report of the Committee says—

> "Mr. Miller states that copies of the last-mentioned report and other documents were sent on the 9th of June, with the letter of that date, set

forth in the Appendix, to Mr. Wilde and to Mr. Payne. Mr. Wilde denies that the letter and copies were ever received by him or Mr. Payne; and no acknowledgment of the receipt of this report was either asked for or received by Mr. Miller. About the same time, however, it appears that both Mr. Wilde and Mr. Payne received blank envelopes from the Court of Bankruptcy, about which neither of those gentlemen thought it necessary to make any immediate inquiry. Your Committee have directed their attention closely to this matter, because it appeared, on examining the letter-book kept in Mr. Miller's office, that he had with his own hand entered in the book a copy of the letter of the 9th of June, which was the only letter so copied by him; and because, from the state of the page in which the letter was copied, and the erasures and alterations of the paging in the index referring to these and other letters to Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde, there was grave cause for suspicion that the entry of this letter was a subsequent interpolation. Mr. Miller, however, stated that he copied the letter on the day of its date after his clerks were gone. Copies of the report and other documents were undoubtedly made for the office at the time by the law stationer, and it is certainly possible that in the hurry of business the copies were lost or mislaid, and were not, in fact, sent. Both Mr. Miller and Mr. Stewart, his clerk, were examined on this point, and were unable to explain the erasures and alterations in the index referring to these letters; but the erasures and alterations in the index to the letter-book are not confined to these letters only, and the book generally has not been kept in a creditable manner."

There could be no doubt that this letter was an interpolation. It would be seen that it was the only letter copied in the handwriting of Mr. Miller, and that he interpolated it in order to give a colour to his letter of July, which I have just mentioned. Meantime the Bill of £500 become due; it was not honoured; Mr. Wilde slept in security; he had had no communication with Mr. Miller; he had, indeed, got a blank envelope, but that was all. From the 16th of May Mr. Miller does not appear to have had the slightest communication with Mr. Wilde until the 26th of June. The bill became due, Mr. Welch was dissatisfied lest he should lose both his money and his place, a communication took place between Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch, and Mr. Miller was put in action between Mr. Welch and the Lord Chancellor; and then again occurred the transactions, the hapless transactions between Mr. Miller and the Lord Chancellor — transactions which if they are permitted to continue without public notice being at once taken of them in such a way as to insure that public reparation shall be made, the purity of official appointments may for ever be despaired of. On the 26th of July, Mr. Miller, finding it necessary to be a little expeditious, writes this letter to Mr. Wilde—

"Sir,—It grieves me much to inform you that, unless I hear in course of post that you mean to apply to be allowed to retire, I have instructions from the Lord Chancellor to serve you with notice to appear before him publicly in open court, and show cause why you should not be dismissed from your office of Registrar. It is said that your state of health is such that you can have no difficulty in obtaining such a medical certificate as would entitle you to retire under the 33rd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861; and, if this be so, I sincerely trust, for your own sake, that you will see the propriety of relieving the Chancellor from the very disagreeable and, indeed, painful duty which is thrust upon him."

There are some interesting points connected with this letter. The Committee says—

"Mr. Miller states that the first part of this letter, including the passage as to the course of post and the application to retire, was strictly in accordance with the directions of the Lord Chancellor, but that for the second part"—

which would inculpate the Lord Chancellor, and with regard to which we are asked to believe that noble and learned Lord knew nothing, they say—"he had no instructions." But the fact was the first part of the letter had answered its purpose. Mr. Wilde, the unfortunate Mr. Wilde, could not discriminate between that for which Mr. Miller had no authority and that for which he had. The letter was official, it was imperative, "the course of post" was all the time allowed this gentleman for consideration, and therefore the House would not be surprised, though the country might be, that Mr. Wilde took the hint so kindly conveyed to him, and he at once procured a certificate of ill health and forwarded it. In the course of some professional experience and of a long life I never heard of more disgraceful transactions. The letter, which was peremptory, suggested that Mr. Wilde should escape the discreditable position of being called upon to answer for his conduct before a Judge who had already prejudged his case, and that he should send up a certificate of ill-health. Mr. Wilde had not in fact suffered from anything but some affection of the eyes, and he states that he had consulted Mr. Hey, an eminent surgeon of Leeds, during some months previous, and says that Mr. Hey had suggested his retiring but that he had not felt the inconvenience so great as to induce him to do so. He now applied to Mr. Hey for a certificate, who must be held to be a man of honour and conscience, and who was almost the only one that was not implicated with the Bethell family, then gave the following certificate :—

> "I hereby certify that I have been consulted by Mr. Henry S. Wilde, on account of a failure in his sight, which was a serious hindrance to him in the performance of the duties of his office. Mr. Wilde first consulted me in August, 1863. At his age I cannot look for any improvement in his vision."

I have seen the gentleman in question, before the Committee, and I must say a sharper one I have seldom seen, though, "at his age, one cannot look for any improvement in his vision." That was the certificate sent to Mr. Miller, who actually drew up the petition to the Lord Chancellor praying for a pension. The Committee state in their Report —

> "The petition, affidavit, and certificate were submitted by Mr. Miller to the Lord Chancellor on the 30th of June. Mr. Miller states that he called the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the unsatisfactory nature of the certificate, and that the Lord Chancellor said that, coupling the language of the petition, the affidavit, and the certificate together, there was a sufficient case to enable him to make the order."

Conscientious and kind-hearted person! "Coupling together"—what a lawyer's phrase!—the petition, the affidavit, and the certificate, he thought there was a sufficient case. Of course this must mean that, taken *per se*, each of these documents was unsatisfactory. This is Mr. Miller's version. The Lord Chancellor's version makes matters worse—

> "The Lord Chancellor, in his evidence, states that he cannot remember his attention being called to the certificate. He says—'The petition, affidavit, and certificate were presented to me, and I ought in strictness to have read them all.'"

That is precisely what Mr. Wilde ought to have done. However—

> "That in the captain's but a choleric word
> Which in the soldier is flat blasphemy."

And poor Mr. Wilde, who ought to have investigated accounts before signing them, received strong hints that he must retire from his office. Says the Lord Chancellor—

> "I ought in strictness to have read them all. I certainly could not have read the medical certificate, or I should not have allowed it to pass upon that certificate."

There is a confession from the Keeper of Her Majesty's Conscience! An officer is guilty of misconduct which is punishable, and for which the Lord Chancellor has summoned him to appear and account for his conduct, and the Keeper of the Queen's Conscience, upon a sham certificate which he did not even go through the formality of looking at, winks at his escape from the punishment of his misconduct! We know it is said that the judge who cannot punish will in time connive at—nay participate in crime. We have the Lord Chancellor not punishing, we have him conniving, and I will presently show that he participated. The Lord Chancellor says—

> "Those papers were certainly all laid before me, and I felt very great embarrassment, undoubtedly. . . . I felt that the charge against Mr. Wilde was not one upon which I could dismiss him without pronouncing a very severe sentence. I was painfully struck with the great inconsistency of having directed him to be served with a notice to show cause why he should not be dismissed, and then permitting him to resign on a pension."

Here the Lord Chancellor admits that he gave Mr. Miller full authority for part at least of his letter of the 26th of July; and I think that any persons who have attained a judgment more mature than that of children must be of opinion that Mr. Miller had authority for the whole of that letter.

> "The inconsistency," continues the Lord Chancellor, "was obvious; but, at the same time, unless I determined to dismiss him, I had no alternative but to allow him to remain in that Department. I thought him a bad public officer, and I thought that it would be a gain to the public if he was permitted to resign; and, therefore, having only those two alternatives, either to permit him to remain or to allow him to resign, I certainly decided upon allowing him to resign; and I accordingly signed the order for granting him a pension."

Upon this the Committee remark—

> "Such haste and want of caution necessarily give rise to suspicion that a vacancy in the Office is the object sought rather than justice to the officer or the public."

In that opinion of the Committee I think no man will hesitate to concur. ["Read on!"] Yes, I will read on—

> "In this instance, however, your Committee consider that no improper motives are to be imputed to the Lord Chancellor."

I give the friends of the Lord Chancellor the benefit of this candid statement by the Committee; but there is a Committee beyond the Committee. There is an appeal to the Committee of the public, and the public will not endorse this verdict. You cannot convict the Lord Chancellor by a confession or a document under hand and seal; but coupling this case with another of the same kind in which the Lord Chancellor condoned a criminal offence and got the place, I ask, Is there not connivance?

Is there not a wilful shutting of eyes to transactions to which the Lord Chancellor ought to have been awake? Is there not a delay which shows how unfit he is, either by the guilelessness of his nature, which I never heard of before, or by the audacity and insolence of office, which may be characteristic of the man, for the exercise of patronage? Is it possible, upon the evidence cited by the Committee, to say that the Lord Chancellor is not answerable for this second appropriation of public funds for the endowment of misconduct or crime for which he had himself pronounced sentence of dismissal? Sir, the very day that this order was signed by the Lord Chancellor without looking at the papers—thus committing the fault for which he had sentenced Mr. Wilde so severely—that very day the office was filled up, and, curiously enough, it was filled up at Mr. Miller's suggestion, Mr. Miller being the friend of Mr. Bethell, who had been always put in motion whenever it was necessary to extricate Mr. Bethell from embarrassment or make him fulfil his pledges. On that very day the office was filled up, without the slightest appearance of necessity, by the appointment of Mr. Welch, who had lent £500 to Mr. Bethell, and who had applied for the office. The Committee say they—

> "Are satisfied that no imputation can fairly be made against the Lord Chancellor with regard to this appointment."

Now, again, I ask, what do the public think on the subject? I should like to know what other candidates applied to the Lord Chancellor for the office? Was Mr. Welch the only applicant? Or was he the only applicant who had lent Mr. Bethell money on that gentleman's flimsy security? Sir, Mr. Welch was not the only applicant, but he was the only applicant who had lent money to Mr. Bethell. Mr. Welch having got the place, Mr. Bethell's credit at once rose. He returned to the country and became as importunate as ever. We then turn back—because the dates are a little mixed up—and we find that shortly after his return to this country—about July or August—having got into credit by fulfilling his engagement with Mr. Welch, he appears to have asked that gentleman for more money. There was an "engagement," to which both Mr. Harding and Mr. Welch were privy, and the latter gentleman frankly admits that he lent the money for the purpose of getting the place. Having asked for more money, we find that on the 10th of September, 1864, Mr. Bethell, after he had become hopelessly insolvent, obtained a further loan of £200 from Mr. Welch without any security. On the 7th of February, 1865, Mr. Welch lent him £50 more, and about the 20th of the same month a further sum of £300; but Mr. Welch states that he had refused him accommodation in the previous November. The fact, however, is that on the 20th of February, 1865, Mr. Welch, then the Registrar at Leeds, had advanced Mr. Bethell £300 in addition to £750 before advanced to him. Then the Report says—

> "Your Committee have given the more prominent facts or statements bearing on this matter. For minute details they refer to the evidence of the parties concerned. The statement of Mr. Harding is irreconcilable with that of Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch."

But is it not possible to reconcile that statement with the facts? We have the fact of the loan, the motives of the loan, the promise of the loan—we actually have the agreement on which the loan was obtained, and evidence that the agreement was carried out; and it is too much to say that we are called upon to ignore the facts and not pronounce an opinion upon them. The facts are clear, and demonstrate a corrupt bargain. Mr. Welch made the further advances in order that he might be advanced to a more lucrative place in London—

> "Mr. Harding's statement," say the Committee, "if true, discloses a corrupt bargain between the three parties; if false, it is a gross attempt at extortion. One or other of these conclusions would be established by a judicial investigation of the facts of the case; but as each of them involves the liability to a charge of a highly penal character, your Committee, not having the opportunity of examining witnesses upon oath, or of bringing the persons inculpated to a formal trial, purposely abstain from expressing any opinion as to which of the two views above mentioned ought to be adopted. They consider it their duty to observe, that the indisputable facts are such as to render it essential to the public interest that the case should, as soon as possible, be made the subject of legal investigation."

In that opinion I entirely concur; thus you have the first part of the Report inculpating the Lord Chancellor in the severest way for haste and oversight, for permitting this gross transaction to be blotted out as far as he was concerned, and for granting a pension to an officer whom he believed wholly undeserving of a pension, and who could never have obtained it but for the connivance of the Lord Chancellor, and the fact that he willfully abstained from looking at this certificate. You then have Mr. Harding, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Bethell implicated in the corrupt bargain for the sale of an office. But now what takes place further? It is clear that the further loan from Mr. Welch was on the condition that Mr. Bethell would obtain his transfer to a more lucrative office in London, Mr. Bethell succeeding to Mr. Welch's place at Leeds. It appears that, on the 22nd of February, two days after the advance of the £300 by Mr. Welch, the Lord Chancellor, at the instigation of Mrs. Bethell or Mrs. Skirrow, hinted that Mr. Bethell might obtain an office in the country, if a vacancy were to take place. Mr. Bethell knew where to look for a vacancy. Mr. Welch was his creditor, the liberal lender of money, without the slightest prospect of being paid in kind, trusting to the honour of a gentleman who appears to have rather fugitive notions of honour. Mr. Bethell went to Leeds on the following day, and saw Mr. Welch at his office on the 24th, and it is clear it was generally understood that Mr. Bethell was shortly to be appointed registrar at Leeds, and that Mr. Welch was to be transfered to London. Mr. Welch had bought one place cheaply, having given only £500 for it, or about half a year's salary. So satisfied was Mr. Miller, the intimate friend of Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch, that the arrangement was to be carried out, that with great zeal, and without authority, he prepares two appointments carrying out the corrupt agreement, which the Lord Chancellor wilfully abstained from knowing—because he must have been aware that the persons about him were trafficing in his name; that he was appointing a gentleman to a valuable office at the solicitation of a worthless son, and that it was not likely that his influence had been obtained in a creditable manner. The transaction was clearly disgraceful to all concerned. On the 26th the Lord Chancellor states that, in consequence of some information he received as to the misconduct of his son at Paris, he determined not to appoint his son to office. Now I believe I can state what was the real nature of the information that led the Lord Chancellor to come to that decision. On the 24th of February in the present year it so happened that the Edmunds' scandal in the House of Lords was completed, and very shortly afterwards, on the 26th and 27th, it became the common topic of discussion in the clubs and newspapers, and a few days later it likewise became the subject of a Question in this House. The information, the receipt of which induced the Lord Chancellor not to appoint his son was simply the universal outcry which followed upon the other job—the transaction by which the Keeper of the Queen's Conscience ignored the offence of a most unworthy officer, and connived at his getting a pension, which, to the Lord Chancellor's eternal disgrace, has been ignominiously rescinded on the ground that it was improperly granted, and that its continuance would be dishonest and disgraceful to the country. That transaction began to be noised about, and that was the true reason that the appointment of Mr. Bethell was not carried out, and that Mr. Miller's zeal was not successful. The transaction was blown up and disclosed in the House of Lords. A Committee on the Edmunds' case was appointed, and on the 7th of March a question, leading to a discussion, was asked in this House by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn. You see the two things are entirely coherent. On the 20th of February the money was lent, and the appointment was sanctioned by the Lord Chancellor at the instance of his daughter-in-law. On the 24th Mr. Bethell goes to Leeds to carry out the transaction, and on the 27th the appointment was annulled because the country was scandalized by the Edmunds' case, and thought—to use the language of the Duke of Wellington—that "it was too bad." These were unfortunate transactions for this unfortunate family, and left beyond hope the possibility of wiping away the stain on the pure administration of justice. The highest officer of the Crown has been twice convicted and twice pardoned for having connived at and sanctioned, for the advantage of his family, perhaps in the hope that things might be done secretly and pleasantly, the grant of an improper pension. I may say, and I am sure the country will re-echo my sentiment, that it is wonderful that the person now filling the situation of Lord Chancellor, who is the highest judicial officer of the Crown, is still Lord High Chancellor. Has the pension granted by his gross misconduct been withdrawn? Is there no pride in him, and is there no attempt to make his conduct pure in the eyes of the country? Is he insensible to shame, and is it possible that he is destitute of the merest glimmerings of those feelings which operate upon gentlemen? If he have not a virtue, why does he not affect one? Why does he not tender his resignation and thereby make some return for the outrages he has committed? The questions I am about to ask are connected with the last observations in the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court. It is there stated that—

> "Although some of the questions asked in your honourable House, which led to the appointment of this Committee, were founded on information which was not thoroughly accurate, yet the general impression created by the sudden retirement of Mr. Wilde, and the pecuniary transactions which took place between Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch, coupled with the representations made by Mr. Bethell on his visit to Leeds, were calculated to excite the gravest suspicions; and your Committee are of opinion that the inquiry which they have conducted was for this reason highly desirable for the public interests."

I wish to ask the Attorney General, whether the pension to Mr. Wilde has been re-called; whether Mr. Welch has been dismissed from his office; whether Mr. Miller has been dismissed from his office; and whether the Lord Chancellor has been kindly asked to retire on a pension in justice to those officers who were guilty of no greater misconduct, but who were not equally protected by the arm of the law?

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Longfield.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, The hon. and learned Gentleman has imposed on me a task of no ordinary difficulty. The difficulty which I feel is much more owing to my own determination not to permit the feelings which I entertain to get too much mastery over me, than to any inability to deal with the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman or with the questions he has addressed to me. I thought that in this assembly, of all others, the highest in England and the world, even the meanest man might expect justice, and I should have imagined that the same measure of justice would not have been deemed unfit to be extended to one filling the highest and most dignified position under the Crown. It appears that there are hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite, whose ideas of justice are far different from mine. I thought that in order to judge and condemn it was necessary that we should be in possession of the evidence on which our opinions might properly be formed. The Report of the Committee on this occasion was in print on Saturday last, and no time will be lost in printing and distributing the evidence. On Thursday next—two days hence—or on Friday at the very latest, the evidence will be printed and in the hands of all Members, who will then be able to form their opinions on it; and those who are disposed to attack will have legitimate materials for their object, while those who have to meet the attack will also be in possession of materials for reply; but I never before heard, whether in the case of a man of high degree or a man of low degree, that it was deemed a course worthy of this House or of any Member having the honour of a seat in it, that there should be made a deliberate attack, founded on a Report, itself based on evidence, without waiting until the evidence was in the hands of Members. If anything could aggravate the wrong done on this occasion it is the fact that the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Longfield) does not adopt the decision of the Report; for in that Report I find it stated as the deliberate judgment of the Committee, founded on the evidence and the facts, which they considered to be established by the evidence, that they acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde. Well, that may or may not be the conclusion which the House will adopt when the evidence is before it; but to ask the House not only not to wait for the evidence, but to reverse that decision of the Committee, is a course which I believe has hitherto been unprecedented, and which I trust will never again be followed. It is not competent for me to follow the example of the hon. and learned Gentleman and go at full length into all the matters to which he referred; but to a certain extent I am able from information which is public, and with respect to which we need not wait for the evidence, to point out the wrong that has been done by many of the hon. and learned Member's remarks. The hon. and learned Gentleman has spoken as if the House had no grounds for believing that there were in the Court of Bankruptcy any abuses to be inquired into.

MR. LONGFIELD: I said there were many, owing to the Lord Chancellor's supineness.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: All I can say is that I think it would have been at least more candid to believe that the head of that Court, who was bound to discharge the grave function of superintending its administration, might, in the inquiries which he instituted into the manner in which subordinate officers had performed their duties, have had some other motive than that of obtaining appointments for his own advantage. And unless the House, departing from the judgment of the Committee, are really prepared to presume and believe that the Lord Chancellor was cognizant of the corrupt means which are stated to have been used by a particular individual to procure an appointment in the Court of Bankruptcy, then I say that upon grounds which are apparent to all in this matter, the Lord Chancellor cannot possibly have been actuated by any improper motive. For what are the facts? They are these—that he instituted inquiries which commenced on the 6th of April, 1864, when the son of the Lord Chancellor, who has been named, was already in possession of an office more valuable than that at Leeds, and could have no possible reason for desiring to have that office; and it was after these inquiries had been instituted that the Lord Chancellor called upon and required his son to resign the appointment which he held, on account of his being in pecuniary embarrassment. And the Lord Chancellor from that day to this, so far from having been open and accessible to influence exercised by his son in any matter of appointment, has not since then even seen him, nor had any communication with him, even by letter, except upon the occasion of a family event to which I need not refer, and when letters were written by him on the subject of these very inquiries. So that whatever may have been the culpability of that person—and it is the deep misfortune of the Lord Chancellor to have a member of his family so little worthy, I regret to be obliged to admit, to bear his name—I should have thought that a generous House of Commons would not have regarded that, at all events, as a ground for believing all sorts of evil against the highest judicial officer in the realm. It will be seen, when the evidence is before the House, what ground there is for believing that, after Mr. Bethell was compelled by the Lord Chancellor himself to give up a more lucrative appointment in London, in April, it was impossible for him to exercise any influence in obtaining any appointments whatever. Were these things done in a corner? Far from it. In June the Committee of this House on the Law of Bankruptcy was sitting, and the Lord Chancellor then communicated to the Committee the whole of the proceedings that were being taken in the matter of Mr. Wilde, at Leeds, and the evidence connected with that matter was printed and laid before Parliament before Mr. Wilde's resignation occurred. It is impossible, therefore, to believe for a moment that in the conduct of these proceedings the Lord Chancellor had or could have had any motive whatever except a desire to discharge his duty to the public. With regard to the appointment of Mr. Welch, the Lord Chancellor never saw Mr. Welch in his life. ["Hear, hear!"] Does the hon. and learned Gentleman mean to say that recommendations coming from professional and creditable sources may not be such as to justify the appointment of an individual who is personally unknown to the Officer of State who makes that appointment? Mr. Welch had been long before recommended to the Lord Chancellor for a similar office by Sir William Atherton, by Mr. Edward James, the Attorney General of the County Palatine of Lancaster, by Mr. Manisty, one of the leading counsel of that circuit, and other gentlemen of eminence. And whatever may have been said in his favour by the Lord Chancellor's son was said long before these transactions of which we have heard with so much sorrow. Mr. Welch had been recommended by competent persons in the ordinary way; and unless the House is capable of believing, against the judgment of the Committee, that the Lord Chancellor knew of this attempt to bribe (supposing such an attempt to have been made), what possible motive of an improper character could the noble and learned Lord have had in appointing Mr. Welch? But it is not this alone. There was another person in the same position as Mr. Welch—namely, Mr. Payne, who resigned a little later, and the Lord Chancellor appointed another perfect stranger in his place. There could never be a more unworthy and unjust accusation than upon these materials to say that the Lord Chancellor was actuated by anything like a corrupt, personal, or improper motive, either in the steps which led to Mr. Wilde's resignation, or in the appointment of Mr. Welch in his stead;

and the Committee have arrived at that conclusion. The hon. and learned Gentleman, using the language of an advocate at the bar, of a counsel addressing a jury at the Old Bailey, and departing from the language of the Committee, said the Lord Chancellor had thrown out hints that there might be circumstances under which he would consent to his son having an appointment in the country. Surely the right hon. and learned Gentleman, in the absence of the evidence, might have limited himself to what the Committee said about the candid statement made to them by the Lord Chancellor. ["Hear, hear!"] Gentlemen might do better if they suffered their own feelings to guide them in such a matter instead of party spirit and personal animosity. ["Oh!"] I think there are few Gentlemen present who would severely condemn a father for no more than this—that on intimate personal friends and near relatives coming and representing to him that there was a prospect of improvement in the conduct of the son for whom, after all, a father may be permitted to have a father's feelings, he did not say that he would or could then accede to what he had at all former times refused to do, but simply said he would take what they had represented to him into consideration; for it never went further than that. After a consideration of three or four days more, he finally decided that it could not be done; and he candidly told the Committee that in coming to that conclusion he was influenced by information he had received as to the unsatisfactory conduct of his son in Paris. What is the sum and substance of the Lord Chancellor's offending here? Why, that for a period of four days he suffered himself to consider whether it was possible to justify a more merciful and lenient course towards his son than he had previously thought it was his public duty to take, and arrived at the positive conclusion that he could not do so. The Committee have given their verdict upon these transactions, and have found that there was no ground for imputing to the Lord Chancellor anything but a want of caution with respect to the pension to Mr. Wilde. But the hon. and learned Gentleman, without waiting for the evidence, desires the House to infer that in some way or other the Lord Chancellor has been guilty of corruption in this matter. With respect to the pension to Mr. Wilde, the Lord Chancellor states that Mr. Wilde's offences were quite serious enough to justify him in giving him the notice which was served upon him, but that it would have been a harsh and severe course of proceeding to have summarily dismissed him. Therefore, the pension, although it was granted in a hasty manner, was given from no really improper motive. I must now deal with the questions which the hon. and learned Gentleman has put to me with respect to the persons implicated in this matter. I will state what the Government has thought it their duty to do. As soon as the Report was in print they took it into consideration, and on Saturday last this Resolution was come to by my noble Friend at the head of the Government—to cause the Report to be laid before the Law Officers of the Crown, in order that, if they found that sufficient grounds existed, those criminal proceedings might be instituted against the persons implicated in the charge of corruption, which the Committee appeared to think ought to be taken. I think the House will be of opinion that that was the right course for the Government to adopt. I also think that the House will, probably, be of opinion that, if these proceedings ought to be taken, it would not be right now to discuss the grounds upon which a criminal charge may be brought. As to the other persons concerned, who, if the Committee came to a right conclusion, may be subjected to criminal prosecution, I think it would be unjust towards Mr. Welch, pending those proceedings, to remove him altogether from his office, but my impression is that, if a criminal prosecution is resolved upon, it would be proper to suspend him from the discharge of its duties under the circumstances. With regard to Mr. Miller, I do not understand the Committee to have done more than to express their disapprobation of his mode of proceeding, and his officiousness on several occasions. I do not understand them to consider that he was implicated in any act of corruption, although the hon. and learned Gentleman seems to be of a different opinion. Whether there are grounds for a prosecution against him we shall be better able to judge when we see the evidence. As to Mr. Miller also, the evidence ought to be seen before we determine whether any steps ought to be taken with regard to him. I think that I have now answered all that the hon. and learned Gentleman can expect me to answer; and I believe the House will agree with me that it is to be regretted that he did not deem it right to postpone this discussion till a future opportunity.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, I do not rise to say many words on this subject, particularly after what has fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman (the Attorney General), who has stated that if the evidence bears out what is contained in the Report with respect to certain parties to these transactions, prosecutions will be instituted against the parties implicated, by direction of the Government. But, while I pass by that part of the case, I cannot help adverting to that part which does not require the support of extraneous evidence. Having regard to the position which the Lord Chancellor holds, and actuated by no party feeling, I must say, looking to his own admissions, that it appears to me they do affect in the strongest degree that dignity and integrity which ought to attach to a person holding the high office which he fills. And when we consider the course which has been pursued with regard to the pension of Mr. Wilde, the dissolution being so near at hand, and no one knowing when the evidence will be ready, the House would have neglected its duty if it had not taken the earliest opportunity of calling attention to the Report of the Committee. What are the facts of the case? There was a charge made by the Lord Chancellor on the 16th of May against Mr. Wilde, consisting of three items—first, that accounts had been certified by him which had never been seen by him; second, that he was in the habit of taxing the Bills of the messengers without calling for vouchers for the sums alleged to have been paid by them; and, third, that he had borrowed money both from the official assignees and messengers of the Court, thereby sacrificing his independence and efficiency. These were three grave and serious charges against a man in the position of Mr. Wilde, and certainly called on the part of the Lord Chancellor for scrutiny, and punishment if the offence imputed had been committed. I shall not go into the merits of the case, nor pronounce any opinion upon them—I proceed entirely on the admissions which have been made. It appears that on the 26th of July, by direction of the Lord Chancellor, according to Mr. Miller's account, and by the Lord Chancellor's direction to a certain extent, according to his Lordship's own account, Mr. Miller wrote a letter to Mr. Wilde in these words—

> "Court of Bankruptcy, July 26, 1864.
>
> Sir,—It grieves me much to inform you that, unless I hear in course of post that you mean to apply to be allowed to retire, I have instructions from the Lord Chancellor to serve you with notice to appear before him publicly in open court and show cause why you should not be dismissed from your office of registrar."

The Lord Chancellor, therefore, must have supposed that the charges against Mr. Wilde were such as, if committed, would have rendered him liable to be dismissed. I do not quote the latter part of the letter, because the Chancellor says he did not sanction it. I will refer to nothing but what the Lord Chancellor himself admits. Mr. Miller, whom the Attorney General, to my great surprise, says has been acquitted of all blame, whereas the Committee charge him with the grossest falsehoods, with having acted officiously, with having undertaken duties which did not belong to him, and other things which seem misdemeanors in his office—Mr. Miller then suggested that Wilde had better get a certificate of ill-health and ask to be allowed to retire on a pension; and Miller, after denying that he had drawn up the petition, and asserting that he knew nothing about it, admitted that he had drawn up the petition containing the certificate which Wilde had so obtained, and upon that petition the pension was granted to Mr. Wilde. What was the certificate? It was of so remarkable a character that it ought to have challenged the scrutiny of any man of ordinary intelligence and desirous to do his duty. Mr. Miller said he called the attention of the Lord Chancellor to it. The Lord Chancellor, on the other hand, said his attention was not particularly called to it. But the House must remember that it was a certificate respecting a man who had been called upon only four days before to resign his office of registrar, or appear before him in open court to answer for his misconduct. On the 30th of July the Lord Chancellor received an application from Mr. Wilde to be allowed to retire with a pension founded on a certificate which does not say that his health is in the least affected, but only that he had consulted some one, at some unknown time, on account of failure in his sight, which was then a serious hindrance to him in the performance of the duties of his office. There is this material fact also in reference to that certificate, that the date appears to be in a different handwriting from the body of the certificate itself. The Lord Chancellor says his attention was not particularly called to this certificate; but when it is considered that the Lord Chancellor had called upon Mr. Wilde to appear and show cause why he should not be dismissed, and Mr. Wilde said he would resign, but asked for a pension of nearly £700 a year —when without a moment's delay—upon the same day—the resignation was accepted and the pension was granted—did the Lord Chancellor consider him a culprit or did he not so consider him? If he considered him a culprit, liable to dismissal, by allowing him to retire upon a pension he was disgracing the office which he held; and by allowing a man whom he had considered a culprit only four days before to escape inquiry into his conduct and the consequences which attached to it, and to retire upon a pension on a certificate which was only a subterfuge and an evasion, he made himself a party to the transaction, and ought to take the responsibility and the consequences. The Lord Chancellor's statement is that the certificate and affidavit were presented to him, and that he ought to have read them, but he does not think that he did. Now, I can readily conceive that the Lord Chancellor might at times be overwhelmed with business and obliged to trust to the officers under him; but here was a man who had been charged with offences, and called on to show cause why he should not be dismissed from his office; and by allowing one whom he alleged to be such a culprit to escape the consequences of his misconduct he has not only grossly neglected his duty, but perverted justice, and made the country a party to the transaction by conferring a pension of £600 a year on a person who, according to the Lord Chancellor's own view, had rendered himself liable to dismissal if not more serious consequences. These are the circumstances of the case as they appear upon the Lord Chancellor's statement; and I repeat that it seems to me that the House of Commons would have grossly neglected its duty if it had not at the earliest opportunity taken this matter into consideration. We could not tell whether the evidence would be produced before Parliament was dissolved, and we have known cases where papers have been delayed to the end of a Session so that no notice could be taken of the subject to which they referred. That might have been so in this instance. The Lord Chancellor upon his own showing had grossly neglected his duty; he had not done that which in his office he was bound to do—he had allowed a man whom he considered a culprit to receive a pension and retire into private life, as deserving the thanks of the country instead of receiving its condemnation—and the House would have failed in its functions if it had not, without waiting for evidence, which might not have been forthcoming in time, expressed its opinion on his conduct.

MR. E. C. EGERTON: Sir, as a Member of the Committee, I must say I think it premature in the House to enter into this discussion until the whole of the evidence is in its possession. It would have been most fair to those whose conduct has been impugned, and also to Members of the Committee, who endeavoured to discharge their duty honestly, faithfully, and impartially, that the House should have had an opportunity of reading the whole evidence and taking a full, impartial view of the whole circumstances, before it was called on to pronounce an opinion on this subject. I rose, however, chiefly to impress on the Attorney General the necessity of having the evidence produced with the greatest expedition. There is naturally grave suspicion in the public mind with reference to this subject. The Report of the Committee has been circulated by the press through the whole length and breadth of the land — the Committee have been violently attacked for having dealt lightly with some of the evidence; and it is most important for the public interests that the whole evidence in the case should be produced as soon as possible. The House, I am sure, is too just and too honest to come to any decision till it has read the evidence *in extenso*.

THE LORD ADVOCATE: As I also was a Member of the Committee, I am anxious to say a few words before the discussion closes. I entirely agree with the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. E. C. Egerton), that it is impossible for the House to come to any just conclusion without the evidence on which the Report of the Committee is founded. The hon. Gentleman says Parliament is about to be dissolved, and the time is short; therefore he is anxious to call the attention of the House to the subject. But this surely can be no excuse for doing injustice, or attempting to draw conclusions when you do not know the facts on which those conclusions are founded. That was exemplified in the strongest manner in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield). I listened to that speech with the greatest possible wonder and surprise; for he not only chose to draw his own conclusions as to motives from facts he found stated in the Report, but he also chose to assume other things as facts which he cannot find there. I shall mention one or two of these. He said that Mr. Miller was a friend of Mr. Welch, and he wished the House to believe that Mr. Miller was cognizant of the transactions between Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch. There is not one tittle of evidence to that effect. On the contrary, Mr. Miller says distinctly that he knew nothing of Welch until the Lord Chancellor had appointed him. The hon. and learned Member made another statement that startled me—he said that, between the time the money was paid to Mr. Bethell and the time Mr. Welch was appointed, communications passed between Bethell and Miller, and that in consequence Mr. Welch was appointed. There is not one word of that in the Report. On these grounds and on grounds like these the hon. and learned Gentleman, with a strength of language unexampled in this House, as far as my experience goes, and with a profusion of epithets I never heard before, charged the Lord Chancellor substantially with being privy to corrupt practices in regard to this office. I am not going into the evidence; but what I state is this—the Lord Chancellor knew nothing of Welch except from the recommendations he had received of him from persons of eminence, and the conversation with his son in 1863. The inquiry into the matter of the Bankruptcy Court of Leeds took place in 1864, at a time when public attention had been called to the state of the Bankruptcy Courts all over the country, and called certainly not without reason, as the Report showed. When the Lord Chancellor commenced his inquiry that inquiry could not by any possibility have been instituted for the benefit of his son, because that son was at the time in possession of a still better office in the Bankruptcy Court in London. That inquiry, too, was not confined to Mr. Wilde, but included the whole of the officials connected with the Leeds Bankruptcy Court. It concerned not only Mr. Wilde,

The Lord Advocate

but the other Registrar, Mr. Payne, the official assignees, and the messengers. That inquiry had, he believed, led to the repayment of over £20,000, which had been improperly retained by the officials of the Leeds and other Bankruptcy Courts. In the course of these proceedings the Lord Chancellor instructed Mr. Miller to send notifications, not only to Mr. Wilde, but to other officials, that unless they forwarded sufficient answers to the charges he should call upon them to show cause in Court why they should not be dismissed. This was on the 16th of May. On the 14th Mr. Richard Bethell, for whose sake it is asserted the Lord Chancellor was privy to a corrupt bargain, was compelled by his father to resign his office. The hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to insinuate that Mr. Bethell and his father were in communication upon the subject of this office. Now, from the 14th May down to the month of February of the next year the Lord Chancellor had had not only no communication of any kind or description with his son, but, notwithstanding the expostulations addressed to him by Mr. Miller, the Chief Registrar of Bankruptcy, he refused over and over again to retain his son in office. Is it not too bad that under those circumstances the Lord Chancellor should be accused of plotting at the end of April, 1864, to make a vacancy for his son, when his son was at that time in possession of a better office, and when he compelled him to resign that office a fortnight afterwards? Was there anything more improbable? Even with the evidence before the House, he believed the attack of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Mallow would have been inexcusable, but it was still less excusable in the absence of that evidence to make such an attack at the close of a Parliament upon the character of any man, high or low, when the means of defence would, to a certain extent, be soon withdrawn. The whole affair spoke for itself. The Lord Chancellor had and could have no personal motive for insisting upon the resignation of Mr. Wilde. But it was argued by the hon. and learned Gentleman that the Lord Chancellor knew nothing of Mr. Welch. The Lord Chancellor, however, knew that Sir William Atherton and the leaders of the Northern Circuit had recommended that gentleman for an appointment of this nature. The question as to the conduct of the Lord Chancellor in permitting Mr.

Wilde to resign at all was entirely unconnected with the question as to his participation in the corrupt transactions detailed before the Committee. The Lord Chancellor did not require Mr. Wilde to resign, but he directed Mr. Miller to send to him the same notice he was to send to other officials. Whether the Lord Chancellor ought to have weighed this certificate more cautiously was a question entirely separated from anything else; and, supposing that that certificate had been thoroughly correct, he could not agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Mallow in believing that the Lord Chancellor did wrong in permitting Mr. Wilde to resign. The charges against Mr. Wilde did not, as in another unfortunate case, involve any question of personal dishonesty. Mr. Wilde was, no doubt, accused of practices which had brought the Court into considerable disrepute, but the charge against him was simply that of permitting the official assignees and the messengers to retain certain sums of money in their hands, and with exhibiting a laxity in reference to the taxation of the accounts. It should be remembered also that Mr. Wilde said he had only followed the practice of Mr. Payne, a gentleman of more than eighty years of age, and that the Lord Chancellor, severely condemning the conduct of both, had permitted both to retire. There was no imputation against their honesty, though there were great imputations upon the mode in which they had conducted the business of the Court. That is an element the House ought to entertain when they are considering this question, but it is a totally different matter to that of which the hon. and learned Gentleman has spoken. From May, 1864, until February, 1865, the Lord Chancellor had nothing to do with Mr. Richard Bethell. He had been warmly appealed to by his family on behalf of his son, but he had absolutely refused in the strongest manner to give him an appointment. But in February, 1865, he did say, that if his son's debts were adjusted and his creditors satisfied, he would consider whether he could not give him a country appointment. Was there anything wrong in that? I think if it is so held it will be dealing out a measure of injustice to the Lord Chancellor, because no man would so deal with a stranger, much less his son. That was on the 22nd of February, and on the 26th Mr. Skirrow, the person to whom the statement was made, went to the Lord Chancellor at his own request, and was told by his Lordship that he was resolved not to give his son any appointment at all. The hon. and learned Member for Mallow threw out the insinuation that it was in consequence of the scandal in another place that the appointment was not made; but he did not go into the dates. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that the appointment of Mr. Bethell was announced on the 24th; but two days afterwards the Lord Chancellor announced that he would do nothing for his son. In the interval nothing had taken place. The Question was asked in this House on the 3rd of March, and no proceedings took place in the House of Lords until the 27th. It is an injurious and an incorrect insinuation. It is manifest that the Lord Chancellor had resolved from the beginning not to give the appointment to his son; that he was for a moment overcome by strong pressure to say that he would not finally exclude him from office; but when he came to inquire how his son had been conducting himself in the interval he returned to the sternness he had maintained for eight months previously, and resolved that he would not appoint him. So far from there being any imputation upon the Lord Chancellor's conduct, as far as these matters are concerned, I say, on the contrary, that the noble and learned Lord has suffered under imputations founded on no facts whatever, and that he has suffered the still more grievous hardship of having been brought into that position by a member of his own family, although he himself has acted in a firm and honourable manner, however painful it was to the feelings of a father to do so. The disclosures in the Committee in regard to other characters in those transactions are very painful certainly—upon these I do not wish to say a word; but the impression on my mind is that, so far as the purity of his motives are concerned, the Lord Chancellor had no object whatever except on the one hand to do—as I believe he has done—call the attention of the public to the state in which the Bankruptcy Courts of the country were placed, and to deal with a strong hand with those who seemed to require it; and, on the other hand, to deal out the strictest and most impartial justice even to a member of his own family.

Viscount CRANBOURNE: I do not rise to say much in reference to this subject, because I concur in the opinion that it was not desirable that those who have their knowledge on hearsay only should enter into such a discussion. But I am bound to say that, although one must excuse a good deal of the language which falls from advocates who have received a brief for the defence in rather a difficult case, the imputations which have been thrown out against the hon. and learned Member for Mallow are wholly without foundation. That hon. and learned Gentleman, at all events, has not spoken without a knowledge of the evidence, for he was present during the investigation; and he has not spoken to a Government ignorant of it, because the evidence was furnished them from day to day.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have not seen a word of it.

Viscount CRANBOURNE: Then I regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman should have been so ill instructed. But the Lord Chancellor had seen the evidence. It was not, therefore, true that either the attack or the defence had been made in ignorance.

Colonel DOUGLAS PENNANT rose to explain. The Lord Chancellor, in his evidence, stated that so far from making any complaint of not having received the evidence, he wished to come before the Committee and be examined before he was aware of what had been said. The Committee, however, considering that it was virtually a trial of the Lord Chancellor, thought it to be their duty, in strict fairness to all parties, that the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Ferrand), who made the accusation, and the Lord Chancellor should be furnished with the evidence from day to day.

Viscount CRANBOURNE: That bears out my statement accurately, and so disappears that whole fabric of virtuous indignation with which the Attorney General, almost bursting into tears——

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have not seen any one of the papers.

Viscount CRANBOURNE: That is another proof of the amount of cordial harmony and co-operation existing between the Members of this admirably constituted Government. We can, of course, understand that the Lord Chancellor may not have thought it wise to intrust the evidence of his proceedings to the Attorney General. We are all of us acquainted with the high character of that hon. and learned Gentleman, and we can well understand that the Lord Chancellor may not have cared to submit to him the details of these disclosures. In defence of the hon. and learned Member for Mallow, I desire just to say that the natural indignation which any one would have felt at hearing these details affords a very sufficient explanation of the course he has taken in laying before the House his own conclusions on the subject, and also for asking the Government the questions which he has put. I heard with regret from the Attorney General the statement, which on reconsideration I think he will feel it wise to retract, that no proceedings whatever were to be taken against Mr. Miller.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I stated that until I saw the evidence it was quite impossible for me to judge whether any and what proceedings ought to be taken. But I do not find that the Committee charge Mr. Miller with being a party to any corruption.

Viscount CRANBOURNE: That is precisely the point to which I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. and learned Gentleman—the bearing of the Committee on the evidence of Mr. Miller. I am not now speaking of the motives of the Lord Chancellor; but what appears to have been the case is, that the Lord Chancellor's patronage was set up for sale; and not only the patronage of the Lord Chancellor, but something infinitely more sacred and important—namely, his judicial power of inflicting penalties. I do not say that Mr. Miller was cognizant of the circumstances, though he certainly was a warm friend of Mr. Bethell; but Mr. Bethell, for the sake of certain money transactions, appears to have used his influence with Mr. Miller, and to have induced him, without authority, to write to Leeds this summary letter, and to take steps for procuring Mr. Wilde's resignation, and afterwards to draw up the appointment in Mr. Bethell's own name, which the Lord Chancellor subsequently refused to confirm. These appear to me to be circumstances full of grave suspicion. When a corrupt transaction has taken place, and a public officer, a friend of one of the parties, has been an instrument, it is difficult to avoid entertaining a suspicion that he was cognizant of the transaction. The Government, therefore, will not be doing their duty unless they institute a close investigation into the facts, and ascertain how far Mr. Miller was really cognizant of what Mr. Bethell was doing, and also, I am bound to add, unless they inflict some punishment upon

Mr. Miller for his extreme and singular misuse of his official trust.

MR. DENMAN: As I understand it, what the Government have undertaken to do is precisely what the noble Lord (Viscount Cranbourne) suggests that they should do—namely, examine closely the evidence when it is in their possession. The noble Lord, who rose for the purpose of justifying the hon. and learned Member for Mallow, put forward a very odd ground of justification. He said that the hon. and learned Gentleman had been present when the evidence was given. The position of the hon. and learned Member for Mallow was that of a juryman in waiting, who may be called on to discharge important functions in the next case; but whose opinion, as a mere spectator, without responsibility, is worth nothing in this case, in which he so glibly volunteers an opinion. In this case he was not called on to act as a Member of Parliament at all, nor did he, as the Committee were bound to do, remain in the Committee-room from hour to hour and from minute to minute taking notes to corroborate his own recollection. I rose, not for the purpose of justifying the Lord Chancellor, but to beg the House to do justice to the Committee, upon whom the responsibility of the inquiry was cast, and who, I think, have been hardly dealt with in this discussion. Five Gentlemen were appointed on that Committee, in addition to the two who conducted the case; three were Gentlemen sitting on that side of the House, and two of them sitting upon this side. From the very moment that their names were mentioned they found acceptance, because those names were felt to afford a guarantee that they would approach the inquiry with a sole desire to do justice in the matter. We are in this position now, that we have not the evidence before us; yet an hon. and learned Gentleman volunteers in its absence, not only to impeach the Chancellor, but to overrule the Committee from whom the Report has emanated. Such, I apprehend, has never been the practice of this House, and it ought, I think, to be discouraged.

MR. HENNESSY: It is said that we have only the Report before us, and, therefore, can do nothing; but the whole of the evidence given before the Committee was actually printed on the 17th of June, ten days before a word of the Report was in type. The Committee very wisely had the evidence printed from day to day, so that every word must have been in type before the preparation of the Report was approached. Ten or eleven days have elapsed since the Committee closed its inquiry, and the evidence is not yet produced. According to an announcement made in another place—which the noble Lord will no doubt repeat—the dissolution will take place nine days hence. Having waited ten days already, if we wait ten days more Parliament, consequently, will be at an end. In the papers presented to Parliament some weeks ago with reference to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and in the present Report from the Select Committee, the hon. and learned Member for Mallow had, I think, abundant information to warrant his remarks.

MR. AYRTON: The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hennessy) seems to think that somebody has grossly failed in his duty because the House has not already received this evidence. That, I think, is jumping to a very summary conclusion, regardless of the facts; because, although the inquiry may have closed, some days are usually allowed to have the proceedings regularly indexed and examined by the Clerk. I say this upon general grounds merely. I know nothing about the evidence, and therein I fancy I am in precisely the same position as the hon. and learned Member.

MR. HENNESSY: I have ascertained that the evidence was in type ten days ago.

MR. AYRTON: We all know as well as the hon. Member that the evidence is printed from day to day; but beyond that fact I venture to think that the hon. Member knows nothing to justify him in imputing motives. The noble Lord (Viscount Cranbourne) also appeared to labour under some misconception with regard to Mr. Bethell's share in this matter, and one might have thought that a reasonable amount of imputations was to be found in the Report without exaggerating or adding to them. As far as the Report goes, there is nothing whatever to show that Mr. Bethell in any way counselled the steps taken in connection with Mr. Wilde's resignation, or derived any advantage from it. I mention this to show how injurious it is to embark in a discussion of this personal nature, without having proper materials before us; for if the noble Lord has evidence in support of his statement outside the contents of this Report, he is speaking of something with which the House is not acquainted. But I take it for granted that the Report is correct on the point; and if so grave a matter had been proved to their satisfaction, the Committee would not have slurred it over or concealed it, and therefore that the noble Lord fell into error. From the terms of the notice given by the hon. and learned Member for Mallow, I had no notion that he was going to travel into anything outside the four corners of the Report, or to build up a much wider case than could be made up from the materials supplied in that document. I scarcely think that he was right in travelling beyond its statements. Some hon. Members appear to think that the Government ought to possess a perfect knowledge of all the proceedings of the Committee. I cannot help thinking that a very gross assumption. Copies of proceedings in Committee, when furnished to any person, are always held to be confidential, and it would be a breach of faith to let documents which were thus supplied for a particular purpose go out of a person's hands and be applied to objects entirely distinct. I therefore cannot see how the Attorney General or how the other members of the Government can be expected to have cognizance of the proceedings before the Leeds Committee. It is very easy for us to sit in judgment upon the delinquencies of other people; but if any one were to sit in judgment upon the acts of any Member of this House, upon our sins of omission and commission, I think we should find it very difficult to escape without censure.

Sir LAWRENCE PALK: I desire to say only one or two words in connection with this subject. I beg the House to observe that through either the extreme leniency or negligence of the Lord Chancellor upon two occasions pensions have been granted to persons unfit to receive them. I trust that this fact will not be forgotten, and I feel convinced that the country will ask whether a high official who has twice been guilty, under circumstances of peculiar suspicion, of permitting pensions to be given to unworthy persons, is one who is deserving of the honour and respect of the profession of which he is the leader.

Mr. SCULLY: I must express my regret at the tone the discussion has taken. I am in the same position as the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). From the terms of the Question which the hon. and learned Member for Mallow put on the paper, I did not think it possible that such a discussion could arise, and, therefore, I did not take the trouble to bring the Report with me to the House. I hold that it is quite premature to enter into this question at present. We have not got the evidence, and therefore we must take the decision of the Committee for the present, and they say that they "acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge except that of haste and want of caution." What, then, are we to do? We all know that when a witness gives his evidence it is printed by the next morning; but the usual course for Committees is to report first, and then the evidence is afterwards laid before the table. I do not think it fair to sit in judgment upon the Lord Chancellor without having the facts before us, or to try to damage the character of a distinguished dignitary, because it is supposed that certain evidence is given before the Committee, which evidence we have not seen. It would be more worthy of the dignity of the House and in better taste not to act in a hostile manner towards the Lord Chancellor, when the evidence may probably show that he has been unjustly suspected.

Viscount PALMERSTON: Sir, I am sorry to prolong this discussion even by a few words; but I cannot let it close without expressing the pain, and—if the hon. and learned Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) will allow me to say so—the indignation with which I listened to his speech. Sir, this House is composed of opposite parties, and it is perfectly right for Members of one party to take advantage of any fair ground for commenting upon the conduct of persons belonging to the other party, and especially of persons who happen to hold office. But hitherto it has been the characteristic of this House that, however great our animosities or strong the party feeling which divides Gentlemen on one side from the other, at all events the persons accused should have fair play. Now, the Lord Chancellor has not had fair play from the hon. and learned Member. It appears that the hon. and learned Member for Mallow was present during the whole investigation; he knows, therefore, exactly what the evidence given was; and yet it is stated by those who were also present that the hon. and learned Member has made assertions of matters, as if contained in that evidence, which will not be found in the evidence when it is produced. It will be for the hon. and learned Member to justify his conduct by making out the correctness of what he has asserted.

MR. LONGFIELD: I did not make a single assertion which was not in the evidence; not a single one.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I was also, I must say, much grieved to hear the bitterness of invective which the hon. and learned Member threw into the charges which he made against the Lord Chancellor. He might be slightly justified in stating that which was borne out by the evidence, and which, he says, he heard; but he was not justified in indulging in that bitter personal invective which was not unjustly characterized by the Attorney General as more suitable to the practice of the Old Bailey than to the ordinary practice of the profession to which he belongs. But I complain, moreover, of the manner in which the hon. and learned Member has brought the subject under discussion. If he had intended to make an attack upon the Lord Chancellor, founded on evidence not in the hands of Members, but of which he had cognizance, he ought, at all events, to have given notice of his intention. But the notice which he gave was of a question to be asked; and so little did that notice indicate his intention of making a virulent personal attack on the Lord Chancellor that I was going to answer the question instead of the Attorney General, believing that the real point which he wanted to know was what course the Government was to take when the evidence was produced. I was going to tell him that it was the intention of the Government to submit the evidence to the Law Officers of the Crown, in order that such legal steps might be taken as might be justified by the state of the case. And so much did the Question put upon the paper imply that it was directed against other persons, and not against the Lord Chancellor, that it asks what steps are to be taken against "the parties implicated?" Sir, I can only regret that the hon. and learned Member has taken a course which, I think, is so entirely different and so much opposed to that which even the most violent party Members are in the habit of pursuing; and I am convinced that when this evidence is in the hands of Members they will come to a very different conclusion from the hon. and learned Member, and that they will find that, so far from that evidence being the foundation of charges such as those which the hon. and learned Member has made against the Lord Chancellor, it will bear out the Report of the Committee, which acquits him of being actuated by any improper motives throughout the whole course of these transactions.

Question, "That this House do now adjourn," put, and *negatived.*

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. CHARLES FORSTER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When it was probable, taking the state of Public Business into account, that the Session might be brought to an end?

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I believe, as far as the Public Business before the two Houses of Parliament is concerned, there is nothing which would keep Parliament sitting longer than Thursday week; and that event which we are all looking forward to may take place on that day—Thursday, the 6th of July—at the latest. I know that there are railway Bills now before the House of Lords which some are of opinion would be concluded some few days later than the 6th, and that a wish has been expressed that Parliament should be kept sitting for the purpose of settling the squabbles of those railway companies. But we all know the great public inconvenience which would result from any unnecessary delay with respect to the elections. The whole of the United Kingdom, in fact, is interested in the matter. Great trouble has been taken, great expense incurred, and great inconvenience is felt; and therefore I think the House will be of opinion that Government is right in preferring the public advantage to the interest of these particular railway companies. Indeed, it is entirely in the power of those who have an interest in these disputes to reinstate the Bills next Parliament in the position in which they will be left by the dissolution, which will take place next Thursday week.

House adjourned at a quarter
after Eight o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, June 28, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill—*First Reading*—Turnpike Acts Continuance * (232).

Their Lordships met: and having gone through the Business on the Paper without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter past One o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 28, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Postmaster General * [144].

Third Reading—Clerical Subscription * [*Lords*] [199]; Turnpike Acts Continuance * [227]; Colonial Docks Loans * [226]; Marriages Lamborne * [*Lords*] [237], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Tests Abolition (Oxford) * (85); Capital Punishments within Gaols (30); Bank Notes Issue (Scotland) * (123).

CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS WITHIN GAOLS BILL.

[BILL 30.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. HIBBERT said, he regretted he was obliged to move that the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged. He did so owing to the fact that the Report of the Capital Punishment Commission had not yet been presented to the House. He might be permitted to state that a wrong impression seemed to be prevalent as to the nature of the Bill. It was not intended to authorize what were called private executions. On the contrary, the sheriff would have power under it to admit as many of the public to be present at executions as he should think fit; and certificates from the prison officials would be given that the sentence of death had been duly carried out in each case. If he should have the honour of a seat in the next Parliament, he would re-introduce the Bill.

Order *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 29, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Crown Suits, &c. * (187); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Expiring Laws Continuance * (226); Poor Law Board Continuance (227); Colonial Docks Loans * (231); Turnpike Acts Continuance * (232); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) * (223); Harwich Harbour * (197).

Select Committee — Report — Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) * (183).

Committee — Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment (200); Greenwich Hospital * (179); Fire Brigade (Metropolis) * (215); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (216); Ayr Burghs Election * (186); Falmouth Borough * (201); Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * (212); Inland Revenue * (221); Indemnity * (222); Compound Spirits Warehousing * (224).

Report—Prisons (228); Greenwich Hospital * (179); Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment * (229); Fire Brigade (Metropolis) * (215); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (216); Ayr Burghs Election * (186); Falmouth Borough * (201); Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit * (212); Inland Revenue * (221); Indemnity * (222); Compound Spirits Warehousing * (224).

Third Reading — Carriers Act Amendment * (198); Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * [H.L.] (211); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) * (208); Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) * (220); Rochdale Vicarage * [H.L.] (213); Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [H.L.] (214); Sugar Duties and Drawbacks * (195), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Divine Worship in the Church of England (218).

Royal Assent—Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 61]; Dockyard Extensions [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 51]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 52]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 53]; Pheasants (Ireland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 54]; Oxford University (Vinerian Foundation) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 55]; Sheep and Cattle [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 60]; Trespass (Scotland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 56]; Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 57]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 58]; Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 59]; Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 62]; Colonial Laws Validity [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 63]; Colonial Marriages Validity [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 64]; Defence Act (1860) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 65]; Sewage Utilization [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 75]; Parsonages [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 69]; Malt Duty [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 66]; Kingstown Harbour [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 67]; Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 68]; War Department Tramway (Devon) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 74]; Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 70]; Navy and Marines (Wills) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 72]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 114]; Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 73]; National Gallery (Dublin) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 71]; Mortgage Debentures [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 78]; Union Chargeability [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 79]; Lunatic Asylum Act (1853), &c., Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 80]; Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 77].

DIVISIONS OF THIS HOUSE.

Standing Order No. 39 *considered* (according to Order), and amended as follows: After the Words ("the House shall be summoned") insert "or Notice shall have been in the Minutes").

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Order No. 184, Sect. 2 *considered* (according to Order), and amended as follows: After ("Railway Bill") in the First Line insert ("authorizing the Construction of Works by other than an existing Railway Company incorporated by Act of Parliament, and which has during the Year last paid Dividends on its ordinary Share Capital").

PRIVATE BILLS.

STANDING ORDERS DISPENSED WITH.

The Standing Orders of the House *considered* (according to Order).

Moved, That the Standing Orders of the House be *dispensed with* in relation to Private Bills for the Remainder of the Session.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

LORD CAMPBELL took the opportunity of suggesting that the number of Members forming the Committees upon Private Bills should be reduced from five to three. The requisition of so large a number as five Members rendered it difficult to find Peers to act upon Committees; and the fact was that the business was really done by the Chairman and the two noble Lords who sat immediately on his right and left hand. The other Members of the Committee were purely ornamental. The number of Members of which the Committees of the other House consisted had already been reduced from five to four.

LORD REDESDALE said, he thought that five was a much better number than either three or four. But, while objecting to the reduction of the number of the Members of their Lordships' Committees in ordinary cases, he had to ask their Lordships that two particular Bills should be referred to a Committee, to consist of himself and two other noble Lords who were Chairmen of Committees. This he did under exceptional circumstances, and he hoped that the course he proposed in this instance would not be drawn into a precedent.

Motion *agreed to.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

LORD REDESDALE *moved,*

> "That on Friday and Monday next the Bill or Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the Day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays."

Motion *agreed to.*

DIVINE WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BILL—(No 218.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH said, he had been induced to bring in the Bill by the observations of the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London a few evenings ago on a subject which he (the Marquess of Westmeath) then brought before their Lordships having reference to popish practices in the Church of England. The right rev. Prelate then admitted the necessity of a change in the law, and stated that he should be willing to give his support to any measure having for its object to remedy the existing evils. At present, if any clergyman were proceeded against for any infraction of the Rubrics, it might be necessary by appeal after appeal to go to the Bishop's Court, then to the Court of Arches, then to the Court of Delegates, and then to the Privy Council—a roundabout process, which either prevented a remedy for the evil, or amerced the Bishop in heavy costs. The result was that many persons were encouraged to disregard the law, in the hope that no notice would be taken of their default. The Bill consisted of three material clauses; the first allowed a reasonable amount of singing, and gave an option to read or sing certain parts of the service. The second repealed so much of one of the Rubrics as enacted—

> "That such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

The third required the minister of every parish to conform, and gave power to the Bishop to enforce obedience by suspending him, and assigning a portion of his income to a curate to perform the service. He had received a letter from a clergyman, who stated that he was an incumbent of a parish in the London diocese for thirty years, and that he was one of those who agreed in the main with the principles of Dr. Pusey, and was labouring to promote the revival of what he called Catholicism in England. After such a distinct declaration from one of these clergymen their Lordships would see what clergymen holding these views would do if they could, and the necessity there was of such a Bill as this in order to control them.

EARL GRANVILLE inquired whether the noble Marquess intended to move the second reading?

THE EARL OF DERBY expressed a hope that the noble Marquess would not press the second reading of the Bill. The subject was a very important one, and it was undesirable that the opinion of the House should be taken formally upon the Bill at this time of the Session, and under the circumstances in which the measure was brought in. His noble Friend had, no doubt, done justice to himself in bringing forward the Bill; but he must have known that the day he had named for its second reading was one upon which it would be impossible for their Lordships to discuss it. He hoped, therefore, that his noble Friend would not give their Lordships the trouble of expressing an opinion one way or the other upon the measure.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he was sure that if, after consulting with the right rev. Bench, the noble Marquess should feel it to be his duty to introduce a Bill on this subject next Session, the House would give it every consideration; but he hoped the noble Marquess would not move the second reading of the Bill now before their Lordships.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH said, he would not press their Lordships to read the Bill a second time on this occasion; and moved that the Order for the second reading be discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

POOR LAW BOARD CONTINUANCE BILL.

(NO. 227.) SECOND READING.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl de Grey.*)

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH said, that when a Bill of this nature was brought forward without any observation from the Minister by whom it was proposed, it seemed as though the time was come when it would be better that the Poor Law Board should be made a permanent Department. One great duty would be cast on the Board in consequence of the recent change which had taken place in regard to the settlement of the poor—that of reconstructing a great majority of the unions of the country. The Union Chargeability Bill had been passed without any Returns being laid before Parliament to show the incidence of taxation throughout the country, and he thought it would be found that in many places which had expected to gain great benefit from the change there would be no advantage at all gained. Where the town was large there would be no benefit; while in particular parishes the increase of charge would be enormous. He had obtained Returns from his own neighbourhood, and he found that in Cheltenham, a town of 40,000 inhabitants, in the middle of eleven or twelve agricultural parishes, the benefit would be confined to a rate of 1¼*d.* per head. But in the same union there was an agricultural parish with no poor which paid £25 to the common fund, in which the taxation would be increased 180 per cent. This parish had nothing whatever to do with the town of Cheltenham. In the same way there would be an increase of 100 per cent on the taxation of an agricultural parish in the union of Tewkesbury. The result of this new law, if unaccompanied by a re-construction of the unions, would be that proprietors of land who had well managed their property would be called upon to pay a rate in aid of other proprietors who had neglected or mismanaged their property. He feared that the Commissioners would find that under the new law there would be many more paupers, as the employers of labour would no longer have a direct personal interest in relieving the rates by giving employment. He feared also that there would be less discretion shown in the apportionment of relief, and consequently there would be less economy than there was at present. Another result would be that the Boards of Guardians would cease to be composed of the best men in the parishes, but would fall into the hands of busy meddlers, whose administration would not be so useful either to the poor or to the ratepayers.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, as the Bill was a mere Continuance Bill he had not thought it necessary to trouble their Lordships with any remarks upon it. The apprehension of such evils as the noble Earl expected would flow from the passing of the measure which had been adopted by large majorities in both Houses was, he conceived, a good reason for passing such a Continuance Bill as this. The merits of the Union Chargeability Bill had been so recently discussed by their Lordships that he did not think it was necessary to enter again into the subject.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PRISONS BILL—(No. 228.)

REPORT.

Amendments reported (according to Order).

EARL GRANVILLE stated, that the Government had considered some objections which had been raised on a former occasion by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Chelmsford), and had proposed certain verbal Amendments to meet those objections. With respect to an objection taken by a noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) to the combination of low diet and solitary confinement in cases of short sentences, the Home Office had considered the point, but saw no reason to make any alteration in the clause.

Further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT (1856) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 200.)

COMMITTEE.

Moved, That the House be now put into a Committee on the said Bill.—(*The Lord Steward.*)

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, that he did not desire to offer any opposition to the measure, but at the same time he thought it required some justification, for in effect it handed over the county to the police and the stipendiary magistrates. He wished to call the attention of the Government to an outrage which had recently occurred at Annaghmore in the north of Ireland. It appeared from the report in *The Times* that the Roman Catholics in a district of the north of Ireland were accustomed to celebrate Midsummer's Eve by bonfires. On the occasion in question they had reason to apprehend these festivities would be interrupted by the Orangemen, and accordingly some of the Roman Catholic party provided themselves with firearms. During the festivities on the night of the 23rd of June last the Roman Catholic party were informed that an Orange rabble was coming towards them. The armed Roman Catholics at once proceeded in the direction indicated and discharged their firearms among their opponents, wounding seven people, and one of them so severely that he had consequently died. Such an occurrence would make it appear doubtful whether Ireland possessed any Government or any police, for it did not seem that any steps were taken by the police to prevent an infraction of the peace, although it was well known that this celebration was to take place, and that encounters between the Roman Catholics and the Orangemen had occurred on these occasions in former years. In spite of Parliament being called upon to give its attention to Peace Preservation Acts, and in spite of the lesson which the Belfast riots should have conveyed, there appeared a great negligence somewhere with reference to these matters. He believed that they were ruining the constabulary of Ireland, as far as constabulary purposes were concerned, by drill, parade, and constant attention to other military duties. It was important that these matters should receive consideration, because anniversaries of a similar kind were approaching. He should be glad to know what had occurred with reference to this outrage, and whether any communication had been had with the magistrates, either local or stipendiary, upon the subject.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that he had received from the police a report of what had occurred in the county of Armagh on the 23rd instant, and he had no doubt that by this time a further report had been forwarded to the Lord Lieutenant, who would of course take proper measures. He could not agree with the noble Marquess in his attacks upon the Irish constabulary; and, considering that there were five counties in which these lamentable affrays had occurred, that they contained 1,250,000 inhabitants, and an area of between 4,000 and 5,000 square miles, it did not appear to him very wonderful that the belligerents should occasionally meet. He thought that it would be much more satisfactory if the noble Marquess should move for a Committee to inquire into the matter, instead of making these violent attacks. So far as the anniversaries which it was usual to celebrate in the north of Ireland in the month of July were concerned, he believed it had always been the practice of the Lord Lieutenant to consult with the magistrates and police authorities as to the best steps to be taken to prevent the occurrence of riots in those cases, and he had not the slightest doubt that the necessary measures with that object would be adopted this year.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, that when he brought the question before the House on a former occasion, the noble Earl made precisely the same suggestions as to his moving for a Committee or a Commission; but when he came down to the House the next day to move for an inquiry, expecting the assent of the Government, he was surprised to find that the noble Earl would not assent to the Motion.

Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee (according to Order).

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE *moved* a new clause providing that whenever the Lord Lieutenant exercised the power of proclamation provided in the Bill, a copy of the proclamation should be laid before Parliament within fourteen days.

THE EARL OF ST. GERMANS regretted that the state of Ireland was not such as to render it expedient to dispense with this Act; but the fact was that every Lord Lieutenant since 1847 had thought that the Act should be continued. It was quite true that apparent quietness existed in many places which were proclaimed; but this was more the consequence of the proclamation than a fact which showed the prudence of dispensing with it. It was necessary that the power of proclamation should be exercised to prevent the spread of those illegal societies which set themselves up against the law and inspired the loyal subjects of Her Majesty with continual dread. The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with the advice of the Law Officers, was desirous of withdrawing some of the proclamations, and he thought that the matter should be left in the hands of the Executive. He deemed the Amendment proposed by the noble Earl to be superfluous.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, as the clause was not objected to he supposed it was to be adopted.

Clause *agreed to*, and added to the Bill. The Report of the Amendment to be received *To-morrow.*

Earl Granville

CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION BILL [H.L.]
(NO. 230.) CONSIDERATION.

Commons Amendments *considered* (according to Order); some *agreed to;* some *disagreed to;* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to the said Amendments: The Committee to meet *To-morrow,* at a Quarter before Four o'Clock.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Thursday, June 29, 1865.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—East India (Revenue Accounts).

First Reading—Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment* [*Lords*] [251]; Rochdale Vicarage* [*Lords*] [252].

Committee—Admiralty, &c., Acts Repeal* [*Lords*] [242]; Dockyards Ports Regulation* [*Lords*] [244]; Admiralty Powers, &c.* (*re-comm.*) [*Lords*] [243].

Report—Admiralty, &c. Acts Repeal* [*Lords*] [242]; Dockyard Ports Regulation* [*Lords*] [244]; Admiralty Powers, &c.* (*re-comm.*) [*Lords*] [243].

INDIA—MEDICAL OFFICERS.
QUESTION.

MR. BAZLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true or not, as stated in the *United Service Gazette* and *Home News*, that the Indian Medical Warrant has been cancelled? If such be the case, what measures are to be taken as regards the pay and organization of the Medical Department, and when will those measures be reported to the House? and why, pending such changes, Medical Officers in India have not at least received the pay of their relative ranks?

SIR CHARLES WOOD said, in reply, that he had introduced a Bill last year for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of State for India to obtain a sufficient number of assistant surgeons from those who had entered the Queen's general service by competition to form a Medical Staff Corps for India. The House was pleased to throw out that Bill on the third reading, and he was therefore compelled to maintain a separate establishment for India.

The Government of India had written in very strong terms, pointing out the great disadvantage and great additional expense caused by the maintenance of the double establishment; but no step had been taken in consequence of those representations. The statement, therefore, implied in the question of his hon. Friend was entirely incorrect; the Warrant had not been cancelled, and as far as he had heard, great satisfaction was felt by the Medical Officers in India at their position and pay.

HOME GROWN TOBACCO.

QUESTION.

Mr. SCULLY said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Would it not be practicable to devise some convenient mode of levying a duty upon Home Grown Tobacco, so as to admit its profitable cultivation in these Countries without loss to the Imperial Revenue?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was sorry to say that, while he entirely recognized the importance of the subject and the principle on which the question proceeded, the Government had never yet seen their way to any plan for giving effect to the suggestion. It would be very desirable, if only for the purpose of giving satisfaction to the public mind, that there should be no absolute prohibition of the growth of any commodity in this country. He always had welcomed, and always should welcome, any proposal which purported to provide the means of raising Tobacco so as not to give a bounty upon the growth of it in this country, which would, of course, be hostile to the public interest. But hitherto all such attempts had failed. The plans which had been proposed had all proved unsatisfactory, and he did not think the best authorities were sanguine that any satisfactory plan could be proposed. He should be very glad indeed if his hon. Friend or any one else could solve the problem.

Mr. SCULLY gave notice of his intention to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the subject in the course of the next Session.

BRITISH INDIA AND COLONIAL TRUST AND AGENCY CORPORATION (LIMITED).

QUESTION.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it be true that a Charter of Incorporation has been granted by the Crown to the "British India and Colonial Trust and Agency Corporation (Limited)," and, if so, that he will state the grounds on which such Charter was granted to a Company constituted under the provisions of the "Limited Liability Act;" whether similar privileges will be accorded to other Companies similarly constituted; and whether he will consent to lay the Correspondence in the particular case in question upon the table of the House?

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, in reply, that the Crown had not been advised to grant a Charter to the Company in question. There would be no objection to lay the Correspondence on the table when it was concluded. With regard to giving similar privileges to other Companies, every case must be decided on its merits.

INDIA—GRIEVANCES OF INDIAN OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether the Royal Commission to inquire into the grievances of Indian Officers has been appointed, the names of the Commissioners, when the Commission is likely to commence its labours, and whether the 717 Petitions presented to the House of Commons can be brought to the consideration of the Commission?

Sir CHARLES WOOD replied, that he was very anxious that the Commission should have been sooner appointed, but he had had the greatest difficulty in obtaining the services of a suitable Chairman. He was anxious that his noble Friend (Lord Hotham), who had sat on both the previous Commissions, should undertake the duty, but the noble Lord felt an over-scrupulous delicacy on the subject, and feared that, as he had voted with him (Sir Charles Wood) in the division against the Motion of Captain Lewis, it might be supposed that he would not bring that absolute impartiality to the consideration of the subject which would naturally be expected from the Chairman. The noble Lord therefore declined, although he (Sir Charles Wood) was certain that no one else would have doubted the noble Lord's impartiality. The Commission, however, had been appointed. On Monday last the Commissioners held their first meeting, and they had been in communication with him upon the appointment of a Secretary. The names of the Commissioners would appear to-morrow in the *Gazette*.

IRELAND—THE RAILWAY SYSTEM.

QUESTION.

MR. MONSELL said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Evidence taken by the Railway Commissioners on the Irish Railway system will be laid before the House before the end of the Session?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the Railway Commissioners had used every exertion to accelerate their inquiry into the Irish Railway system. They had been unable, however, hitherto either to make a report or to present the evidence, and they thought it better not to bring the subject before the public in an incomplete state.

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

QUESTION.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the second Roman Catholic Bishop about to be appointed to the new see at Malta is to be exempted from all liability to be prosecuted in any Court of Law for any offence, civil or criminal?

MR. CARDWELL, in reply, said, the Bishop of Goza was not appointed by the British Government but by the Court of Rome. In 1860 it was proposed to divide the Bishopric of Malta, and create a separate Bishopric of Goza. His noble Friend at the head of the Government assented to the arrangement on condition that the same restriction imposed on the Bishop of Malta should be imposed on the new Bishop. That arrangement was carried into effect last year, and instructions were given to the Governor of Malta to give effect to the existing state of the law, which was passed in 1828, for the purpose of limiting the ecclesiastical privileges of Malta, and that law exempted from the jurisdiction of the temporal tribunals the persons of the Governor and the Bishop.

INDIA—EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS)—*COMMITTEE*.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SIR CHARLES WOOD said: I must throw myself upon the kind indulgence of the House in the statement which I am about to make. I am not sure whether my voice will enable me to go through with it, but I was very anxious not to delay for a single day the statement which the Committee, I am sure, wishes to be made in regard to Indian finance. If I fail to go through with my statement it will not be from want of will, but want of power, and the Committee will, I am sure, excuse me for making my speech as short as I can. It has been often urged in the House that this statement ought to be made at an earlier period of the Session. Some time ago I gave directions for expediting the accounts from India which are now, according to Act of Parliament, laid on the table by the 14th of May. Under that arrangement they cannot well be printed, and be placed in the hands of Members before the 14th of June. It was found on going through the statement of the Indian accounts that they were kept on the most erroneous principles, and were very confused. I thought it better, instead of trying merely to expedite the accounts, to go into an entire revision of the whole system, with the view of putting it upon clear and intelligible principles of sound financial accuracy. Mr. Wilson did something towards that end; Mr. Laing did still more; but it was not till Sir Charles Trevelyan arrived in India, and set to work with that marvellous energy which distinguishes him, that the task of putting them on a sound footing, was undertaken in earnest. Two gentlemen were sent out from this country to assist in this work—Mr. Foster, of the Paymaster's Office, and Mr. Whiffin, of the War Department. Two other gentlemen also gave their aid, and I am in hopes that before this year is at an end the new and improved system will have been established. It happened with this attempt, as it has often happened with others in India, that it was interrupted from time to time, by the failure of the health of the gentlemen employed; Mr. Whiffin came home, the health of another gentleman entirely broke down, Sir Charles Trevelyan was obliged to come home in consequence of serious illness; so that the work was retarded through the failure in health of two of the principal persons employed in it. I trust, however, that before the end of the year the improved system which has been already applied in Bengal, and partly in the other provinces, will have been brought into full operation, and will have been permanently established throughout India. I hope that those Gentlemen who are naturally anxious for an earlier exhibition of accounts in this country will think that I have done rightly in caring rather that we should have a permanent system of accounts based upon true principles than that for the last, or present, or even next year, the accounts should be presented two or three months, or two or three weeks earlier. With regard to the accounts which are now on the table, it is not necessary for me to trouble the House with many details. It turns out that the surplus for 1863-64, according to the actual accounts, is less than appeared from the regular Estimates. The surplus, according to the regular Estimates, was £257,000, but the actual accounts show that the surplus was only £78,000. That is not a very large amount; the difference is owing to the large stock of duty paid salt on hand from the preceding year. A much more serious matter is the difference between the surplus in the year 1863-64 and that of the previous year 1862-63. In that year the surplus was £1,827,000; in the last year, or 1863-64, it was only £78,000, the falling off being no less than £1,749,000. That falling off, however, is almost entirely owing to that which every gentleman knows to be the most uncertain source of revenue in India—namely opium. Between diminished receipts and increased charge there was a difference in opium returns of £1,673,000, so that, in point of fact, almost the whole difference is due to opium. With regard to the last year, I am sorry to say that the results disclosed by the regular estimates are much less satisfactory than those which I anticipated at the time the Budget Estimate was framed. According to the Budget Estimates there would be a surplus of £823,000, but according to the regular estimates there is a deficit of £263,000, the calculations being, in point of fact, worse by £1,086,000. Now, so far as the revenue goes, it is actually better than was estimated. The Budget Estimate was £46,163,000, the regular estimate is £46,284,000—giving an increase of £120,000. But I am sorry to say that there is an increase of charge of £1,206,000; the charge in England is less, but there was an increased charge in India of £1,562,000. The increase of charge in respect of opium is £453,000; that, however, is a temporary increase. A more serious increase is that on the army of £674,000. In public works there is an increase of £327,000. Now, it is right to say that with respect to that increase for the army there is very little prospect of finding anything to cut off, because, although we have reduced the army considerably, there has been an increase of allowances given to it in order to compensate both the officers and soldiers of the Native army for the increased price which they have to pay for their provisions. The increased price of provisions amounts to £272,000. Then the additional charge for the Bhootan war is about £160,000. A change from half to full batta has been made. Half batta, which was a very invidious thing, and under the circumstances very unjust, has been abolished, and the increase under that head, together with increased pay for the medical officers, and some other minor additions, amount to £242,000. These items make up the additional charge for the army of £674,000. Now, Sir, if I compare the last year with the preceding year, so far as revenue goes, I must say that it is impossible that anything could be more satisfactory. There has been an increase in the revenue of 1864-65 as compared with the actual receipts of 1863-64 of £1,671,000, of which the main items are salt, £588,000; opium, £682,000; and the receipts from sale of building lands at Bombay, which, however, is only of a temporary character, £554,000. But, on the other hand, I am very sorry to say that, although the revenue has increased in a most satisfactory manner, that which is not so satisfactory is that the charge in India for 1864-65 has increased as compared with 1863-64 by no less a sum than £2,262,000. Of that increase of charge £401,000 is on account of opium, £630,000 on account of the army, from the causes which I have mentioned before—namely, increased pay and allowances, a portion only of which entered into the former year, £310,000 for public works, £186,000 for law and justice — that is, for the improvement of the courts of justice throughout the country, £143,000 for education, and £270,000 for superannuations. Now, the House will observe that almost all these charges are charges owing to the improved administration of the country, in which I do not see it possible to expect anything but a steady, though gradual, increase. It is indispensable to execute advantageous public works, and most desirable to aid education and make better provision for the administration of justice. These are the sources of the additional expenditure. I come now to the year 1865-66, and here again nothing can be more satisfactory than the Indian revenue. In spite of the loss of £685,000 in the current year by the loss of the income tax, the whole revenue will be better than last year by £264,000. It affords matter of great satisfaction to find that the increase is general throughout the main items of the revenue. The land revenue is better by £113,000; salt, by £158,000; opium, by £209,000; stamps, £146,000. And I hope that we may without hesitation accept that as a clear proof of the general improvement in the prosperity of the whole country from one end to the other. Again, I am sorry to say, however, that if the revenue has increased so have the charges. According to the Budget Estimate of this year, in spite of the reduction of £753,000 in the charge of opium, there will be an increased charge in India and England over the regular Estimates of last year of about £376,000. This is partly owing to the increased allowances rendered indispensable by the price of provisions to the army, and partly by the increased expenditure on public works, on law, and justice, and police. The increase in the army charge is £426,000; public works, £202,000; law and justice, £210,000; and police, £95,000. That contains, as shortly and succinctly as I can give it, an account of the progress of the revenue and expenditure for the last three years. Before making any more general observations on the subject, I will come to the circumstances of the Budget of this year, the main features of which are the dropping of the income tax and the imposition and disallowance of the export duties. The circumstances of last year were very exceptional, and the variation which took place in the Estimates, which were framed at one time or another in the course of the year, and the difference there shown between income and expenditure were very remarkable. In the Budget of April, 1864, it was estimated that there would be a surplus of £823,000. In a revised estimate sent home in December last it was anticipated that there would be a deficit of £135,000. In February the deficit was estimated at £800,000; and other circumstances occurred which rendered it not improbable at that time that the deficit would be even greater—that is to say, according to the accounts furnished by the Government of India. I mention this now to show the reasons for the change of purpose on the part of the Indian Government. Towards the end of the year the accounts forwarded were of a much more favourable character, and at the time the regular Estimate was framed the deficit had got down to £263,000. At that time, there being a notion that the salt duties might be increased, a large quantity of salt was suddenly taken out of bond, and £170,000 was paid upon that account, which really and truly belongs rather to the present than to last year. If that sum be deducted from the deficit appearing in the regular Estimate, I should not be surprised if, when the actual accounts come to be prepared, the deficit is not more than £93,000. The fact is, as I have stated before in this House, that I was entirely taken by surprise when I heard that the income tax had been discontinued. Up to the middle of March it never seemed to have entered anybody's head, that it was possible to go on without the income tax; and at the time the despatch was written, which is contained in the papers moved for by my hon. Friend behind me, anticipating a very large deficiency and the necessity for an increased expenditure upon public works, the notion of the Government of India was that, maintaining at all events the existing taxation, even if it was not increased, it would be requisite to borrow to a considerable amount and in the financial propositions as ultimately made. The sum to be borrowed was taken at £1,200,000. On the 14th of March I heard from Sir John Lawrence, that they were all agreed that the income tax must be continued; the only question was whether it would not be necessary to increase it. Mr. Maine, one of the Indian Council, who left India on the 24th of March, was overtaken on his way home by the intelligence that the income tax had been dropped, and was quite as much surprised as I was that such had been the course adopted by the Government of India. In point of fact, it was only the day before the Indian Budget was announced that the determination was come to to drop the income tax; and, as may be inferred from the statement I have made, it was owing to the very improved account of the state of the finances which reached the Government of India in the course of the latter end of March. Of course, if things had remained up to the end of the month as they stood at the beginning, everybody was agreed that the income tax must be continued. However, on the last day of March a council was held, in which the only person in favour of maintaining the income tax was Sir John Lawrence. Everybody else was against its being continued. I am sorry, though I cannot say I am surprised, that Sir John Lawrence yielded to what clearly was nearly the universal opinion in that part of India. The views of Sir John Lawrence, expressed in the Minute of Council, seem to me to be those of a far-seeing statesman. I cannot, however, deny that from the views they maintained the other members of Council had some warrant in the promises and expectations which had been held out, though under different circumstances, upon the imposition of the tax. Clearly, if it was possible to do so with a due regard to the revenue of India, the Government were bound to drop the tax. For myself, I think it doubtful whether the circumstances justified that course. However, I do not wish to blame anybody for the course which has been taken. All that we have to do is to look forward and see what is the best course to pursue for the future. It is quite impossible for the Secretary of State here to direct the finance of India. To a certain extent he may control it, but the responsibility rests upon the Government of India, who are much better acquainted than anybody here can be with the state of circumstances, the prospect of revenue and expenditure, the feelings and wishes of the people, and the opinions of persons most competent to decide upon this matter. I should deceive the House, therefore, if I were to assume the power of directing the finance of India, though I do claim and have exercised the power of controlling it. The distinction is very obvious, and I hope hon. Gentlemen will bear it in mind in any observations which they may think proper to make on this occasion. One advantage, at least, may be derived from what has taken place. The attention of the Indian Government will be drawn more closely, perhaps, than by anything else to the necessity of exercising strict economy. Year after year, as the House will have seen, the revenue has increased in the most extraordinary and satisfactory manner; and, although a large proportion of the increase of expenditure is one which I do not think it was in the power of the Indian Government to prevent, nevertheless I think they might have kept their expenditure within narrower limits. When we compare the revenue in India in 1861-62, which was the first year when the income tax came into full operation, with the revenue of the last year, 1864-65, we find that in the first of those two years it amounted to £43,829,000, and in the last to £46,284,000, being an increase of nearly £2,500,000. In the estimate for the next year, 1865-66, the income is calculated to be larger, in spite of loss by income tax of £685,000, than it was last year, in consequence of the increase of the ordinary sources of revenue. The amount next year is calculated at £46,548,000. The actual expenditure in India, excluding interest on railways, was in 1862-63, £36,800,000, and in the Budget for 1865-66 it is estimated at £40,487,000, being an increase of £3,687,000, of which £1,000,000 is due to the army, £1,400,000 to public works, and £500,000 to law and justice. The prices of food, which of late years have been very extravagant, were last year in Guzerat exactly twice as high as the famine prices in the North West Provinces. There is a certain height of price at which the soldiers are granted an increase of allowance, and last year the prices were in parts of Western India four times greater than the amount which entitles the soldiers to an increased allowance. There cannot be any reason to doubt that the greatest possible sufferings were thereby entailed on persons in the lower ranks of almost every department of the public service. The Committee will be aware that it was proposed at the same time to add to the duty on salt, but Sir John Lawrence refused to consent to that measure, and I think he was right in his determination. I do not think that a small increase would have been objectionable under ordinary circumstances, but I think that Sir John Lawrence was perfectly right in saying that he would not consent to take a certain amount of taxation off the shoulders of the rich, who paid the income tax, and transfer it to the shoulders of the poor, who paid the salt tax. With regard to the proposal for levying export duties, I do not mean to say that under no circumstances ought they to be imposed, and they have, indeed, existed to a certain extent in India, but I must own it is the last species of taxation which we ought to have recourse to, and I am not of opinion that the circumstances of the times justified their imposition. The levying of export duties on some of the articles would have been most impolitic. Coffee and tea are infant cultivations in India, and the imposition of export duties on them would be most injurious, and productive of little or nothing in the way of revenue. As soon, therefore, as I heard that the export duties had been imposed I sent a telegram to the Indian Government stating that I would not allow them. An hon. Member asked a short time ago a question respecting the repayment of such duties as had been levied. We have not the full accounts yet of what has been done, but I have directed the Government in India to repay all the export duties which may have been levied. I have already adverted to the extraordinary increase of prices of every sort which occurred at Bombay, owing in a great measure to the extraordinary wealth which flowed into that place for the last two or three years. Another consequence of this was that speculation among the Bombay merchants ran perfectly wild, and I desire to state to the House the amount of speculation which took place in two sets of shares. On the Back Bay Bombay shares 5,000 rupees were paid. In August last they rose to 18,000 premium, in January last they were at 42,000 premium, and in May they were at 5,000 premium. Their value varied from 23,000 rupees in August, and 47,000 rupees in January, to 10,000 rupees in May. The shares of the Elphinstone Land Company in February last were at 180,000 rupees premium. New shares were issued at 1,000 rupees paid, and in February they were at 2,600 premium, and in May at 450 premium. It is not to be wondered at, then, that the gentlemen who invested at very high prices should afterwards, when prices fell so much, have found themselves in a difficult position, and this accounts for a good deal of the pressure which has prevailed within the last few months. Somehow or another —I do not know how — the bankers of Bombay got the power by their charter of advancing money on speculative shares, and they used that power to a considerable extent. I wrote early in the year to Sir Bartle Frere, calling his attention to the necessity of looking after what they were doing; and whether in consequence of my letter or not I cannot say, but the Government directors went down to the Bank and on their representations it ceased to do that which it had been doing for some time — namely, advancing largely upon these shares. It was very wrong ever to have advanced money in that way at all upon a security, which in times of difficulty would obviously be perfectly unnegotiable. Whatever rumours may have reached this country, I wish to state that as far as I can judge from all the accounts which I have received the Bank of Bombay will in future go on in the ordinary way, and there need be no apprehension in the public mind on this subject. I have been asked whether it was my intention to raise any large loan in this country for the service of India, and I have said it was not my intention to do so. I may remark that I think this year may be fairly regarded as a sort of transition year. A new Finance Minister has gone out to India, and it is impossible for me to act until he has had time to consider matters and give a mature opinion upon them. I believe that Mr. Massey's appointment has been received with great satisfaction in India. We all knew him in this House to be a cool-headed, sober-judging man, and I place great confidence in his plain common sense—a quality which I believe goes a long way to enable a man to discharge any public duties imposed upon him. I do not propose to borrow money for public works till I know where I am. If the people of India themselves find the money, we can spend it well for them; and I have stated that when they send me a well-digested plan for useful improvements I might be prepared even in this market to borrow funds for their execution, but that I would not go hand over head to put money into their pockets which they might not expend so economically, as if their plans were carefully prepared beforehand. I think the Committee will agree with me that that is the wise course to pursue. I do not, however, wish the Committee to run away with the idea that there has not of late years been an enormous expenditure upon public works in India. There has been spent upon them, during the last six years, from public funds, £30,000,000, and from local funds £4,500,000, making together £34,500,000. If to that we add the expenditure for railways, amounting to £38,500,000 there has been expended within the last six years upon public works of more or less importance in India no less a sum than £73,000,000. This expenditure from public and local funds has been gradually increasing. If we take the last two years, the expenditure has been upwards of £11,000,000 from public funds, and upwards of another £2,000,000 from local funds, making together £13,200,000 spent in public works, exclusive of railways, during those two years. I will not trouble the Committee with any statement of the general improvement of India, because the state of the revenue is a pretty good index as to that. I read on a former occasion a letter from Sir Bartle Frere, showing that districts which were formerly under jungle had been brought into cultivation. Mr. Temple gives an equally favourable account of districts in which he was Commissioner. The cultivation of cotton has extended, and, what is more important, the capitalists of Bombay are introducing at all the railway stations establishments fitted with machinery for cleaning, pressing, packing, and to some degree spinning and weaving the cotton. I do not think our manufacturers at home have anything to apprehend from this, as the goods so made only displace the produce of the native hand-loom. The great want in that part of India, in connection with the growth of cotton, is the want of labour; and the hand-loom weavers, whose former employment has been displaced, have been set free to devote themselves to agricultural pursuits. A few months ago I saw an article in an Indian newspaper stating that, unless the Government interfered to check the cultivation of cotton and restore the cultivation of grain and food, the people of India would be plunged in great distress. The great object at present of our manufacturers is to obtain a better quality of cotton. I believe that as soon as the Indian cultivators are convinced of the necessity of improving their article, they can and will do it. Hitherto they have had no reason for attending to it. In the appendix to a letter bearing on this subject, and written by Lord Tweeddale, an authority of great experience, I observed the other day that he says—

> "As long as there is so high a price given for quantity, no ryot will trouble himself about improving the quality until the demand for quantity has been satisfied. The only remedy I know is to improve the indigenous cotton plant of India."

Now that has been done, and I do not think the fall in the price of cotton is so very bad a thing. My conviction is that it will drive the ryot to that which is not less important than the production of quantity—namely, an improvement in the quality of the article. Several manufacturing gentlemen came to my room, and showed me a quantity of cotton, saying, "Look what stuff this is." Perhaps, when they listened to an account he was about to read, hon. Members would not be surprised at the description sometimes given of the state of Indian cotton as it reached this country. Dr. Forbes, in describing how cotton was treated in India, said—

> "That portion of the province of Berar which is now being penetrated by the railway yields three times the above amount of cotton, and manual labour is still more scanty. The produce, as it is picked from the field, is piled up in one large heap in the open air, where it remains sometimes for months until labour can be obtained. When first stored in this way, from a short distance it resembles a heap of snow in whiteness; dust storms, however, set in, and the heap becomes gradually covered with fine sand and earth, until at length one can no longer distinguish what the contents may be. A few showers of rain generally succeed those dust storms, and the amalgamation of mud and cotton is completed."

I do not know that on this subject I need say any more; but there is another subject to which I would refer, with reference to which I have answered questions more than once put by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), and on which my hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) has intimated his intention to ask a question—I mean the state of the inquiry in Oude. With regard to that subject, there certainly was at the beginning of the year I must think unnecessary alarm, that in the course they were taking, the Government of India were reversing the policy of Lord Canning, breaking the faith he had pledged, and destroying what was called the native aristocracy of India. I do not think there ever was the slightest cause for these apprehensions, and certainly, as far as the inquiry in Oude is concerned, they are totally groundless. There has been, I know, a good deal of excitement on the subject; but I would only beg permission, in correction of statements that have been put forward, to observe that, although it has been supposed that some new policy had been inaugurated a few years ago, generally called the Thomasonian policy, it was in entire accordance with that which had been pursued from the time of Lord Cornwallis, downwards. I cannot do better than read a portion of a letter from Lord Cornwallis, which I stumbled on accidentally in his memoirs last Easter. Lord Cornwallis says—

> "Neither is the privilege which the ryots in many parts of Bengal enjoy of holding possession of the spots of land which they cultivate, so long as they pay the revenue assessed upon them, by any means incompatible with the proprietary rights of the zemindars. Whoever cultivates the land, the zemindars can receive no more than the established rent, which in most cases is fully equal to what the cultivator can afford to pay. To permit him to dispossess one cultivator for the sole purpose of giving the land to another, would be vesting him with a power to commit a wanton act of oppression from which he could derive no benefit. The practice which prevailed under the Mogul government of uniting many districts under one zemindary, and thereby subjecting a large body of people to the control of one principal zemindar, rendered some restriction of the nature absolutely necessary. The zemindar may, however, sell the land, and the cultivator must pay the rent to the purchaser."

I have read that extract to correct what seems to me a great mistake in many of the statements which have been made on this subject. What has taken place in Oude is simply an inquiry as to whether these rights did or did not exist. It was admitted by Mr. Wingfield, the Chief Commissioner, by the talookdars themselves, and by every one, in the clearest and most unequivocal manner, that if they existed they ought to be maintained. The order of Sir John Lawrence was simply for an inquiry as to their existence. I certainly thought, when I read the order of the Financial Secretary, Mr. Davis, that it went rather further than inquiry; but it is only justice to Mr. Davis to state that the circular he issued had been submitted to Mr. Wingfield, and there could be no doubt, from the approval it met with from Mr. Wingfield himself, of its perfect and complete impartiality. The inquiry has since been going on, and I would take the liberty of reading two documents to show in what spirit it has been conducted on the part of Government. The first is an extract of a letter from Colonel Durant to the Chief Commissioner of Oude, dated Fort William, 8th of April, 1865. He says—

> "I am directed by the Governor General in Council to forward, &c., and to request that you will take every opportunity of explaining to the talookdars of Oude the object and limit of the inquiries now going on, and repeat to them the assurance that the spirit and letter of Lord Canning's policy, and the condition of his sunnuds will be scrupulously maintained."

In pursuance of that direction, Mr. Wingfield addressed the following circular to all talookdars in Oude:—

> "Lucknow, April 19, 1865.
>
> "Sir,—I have been directed by the Governor General to take every opportunity of explaining to the talookdars the object and limit of the inquiries into rights of occupancy going on, and, as I cannot expect to meet many of you for some months to come, I must have recourse to a letter to give effect to the Governor General's instructions. 2. I have always told you, and you have readily admitted, that if right of occupancy existed at annexation on the part of non-proprietary cultivators of the soil, they have been preserved by the condition of the sunnuds, that 'all holding under you shall be secured in the possession of all the subordinate rights they formerly enjoyed.' You will also recollect Lord Canning's words in his speech at Durbar, in October, 1859—'The preservation of the great families of the soil has been encouraged and facilitated. The rights of the humble occupants have been protracted.' 3. The only foundation on which rights of occupancy exist is their previous existence at the time of annexation. But there has been difference of opinion among officials whether they did exist there or not. To remove all doubts on this point is the object of the present inquiry. If the results should be to establish the existence of such rights, they must, of course, be maintained, as you yourselves allow. If, on the other hand, it should prove that they did not exist at annexation, no new rights will be created. 4. I have repeatedly told most of you to wait patiently the termination of this inquiry, which can have no other result than to elicit the truth. I am glad to say my advice has been attended to. 5. You are aware that the policy of Lord Canning was to maintain in Oude a class of superior landholders in an influential position. For this reason he also invested many of you with judicial and revenue powers. This policy had the full approval of the Home Government. It will be steadily pursued in its spirit and letter by the Governor General, and the condition of the sunnuds will be scrupulously maintained."

I think it is impossible to read two documents which more completely express the will and determination of Her Majesty's Government, of the Government of India, and the local Government of Oude. The talookdars themselves admit that whatever rights exists should be preserved, and nobody proposes that new rights should be created. That is what Lord Canning contemplated, and what we have done our best to perform. It will be satisfactory to those Gentlemen who were so much alarmed to know that for the most part the rights of the talookdars have been recognized, and that for the most part a very good feeling seems to have prevailed between the talookdars and ryots. Except in some very disturbed districts the relations enjoined by ancient custom have remained undisturbed, and very few claims have consequently been put forward by the occupiers. There has therefore been little necessity for any judicial decisions, and, as far as I have learned, judicial decisions could hardly be given in favour of claimants whose cases rest upon immemorial customs rather than any tangible rights capable of being established in a Court of Law. In all semi-barbarous countries customs are the protection of the weak against the strong, and as long as things go on well it is of course the interest of the talookdars to retain the ryots on their side. Many of them were retainers and followers of the talookdars in war as well as in peace; but, on account of the universal tranquillity prevailing under our rule, the talookdars are no longer under the necessity of maintaining supporters of their own; and hence the question of how far the talookdars may some day feel it expedient to get rid of the ryots is one of very great importance. Nothing could have been better than the relations existing between the talookdars and ryots under the old system; but we cannot be surprised that people in India, looking mainly to the interests of the masses, should have felt alarmed at the prospect of injury to those masses, arising from the withdrawal of one of the great securities of their position, consequent, though that withdrawal may be, on the increased securities to life and property under British administration. With regard to what has taken place in Bhootan, I think I explained on a former occasion our position in that district. The country is distracted by internal dissensions, and, in point of fact, no regular Government or authority adequate to control the Bhootan chiefs could be said to exist. When, therefore, representations come from our subjects of injuries for which no reparation could be obtained, it became indispensably necessary to take some steps, especially after the treatment experienced by our envoy, whom we had dispatched with a view to bring about a peaceable settlement, in the full belief that he would be courteously received. I was very unwilling to occupy the country, to go far into it, or to do anything that might lead to a permanent occupation. But the position of affairs was this, that the country was subjected to a divided rule, each authority enduring in its turn for six months at a time, and, as hon. Gentlemen may imagine, the unfortunate inhabitants were equally plundered by both. Our main object, in undertaking operations, was to establish one permanent authority, from which securities might be obtained against future inroads upon our subjects. The first step was to occupy the passes leading to the valleys, and the operation was successfully accomplished with the loss of only five men beyond what was owing to the accidental explosion of a mortar. The passes were held in perfect quiet for a month, but at the expiration of that period the Bhootans began to move, and one of the commanding positions held by our troops was abandoned in what I must call a most disgraceful manner. Nothing could be more discreditable than the behaviour of the commanding officer, the relieving officer, or the troops under their command. Another of the passes was also evacuated, and of course it became necessary to retake these posts. They were retaken in the most gallant way, and one of the native regiments distinguished itself in a most remarkable manner by scaling a stockade. There was no great loss on our part, and they inflicted considerable loss upon the enemy. It was not thought desirable to retain during the unfavourable season all the positions at first taken up, so that, with the exception of a few artillerymen and native troops, the body of the forces were withdrawn from the unhealthy districts, and the utmost pains were taken, as far as possible, to insure the health of those who remained. The time during which active operations can be pursued in this quarter is, in fact, very short, the rainy season lasting for about nine months out of the twelve. Since the beginning of April there has been, on this account, a cessation of operations. In the meantime, overtures of accommodation have been made by one of the Rajahs, but we do not yet know what amount of reliance can be placed upon them. Nothing definite can be done till next November or December, and, in the meantime, the Government will have made up its mind as to the course to be pursued with regard to what, after all, is a very trumpery affair; because we are engaged with a people who fight with bows, and arrows, and matchlocks, and have not a twentieth part of the forces that we can bring against them. It is a most unsatisfactory state of things, but one which cannot possibly be avoided under the circumstances. The only anxiety of the Government of India is to put an end to the war as speedily as possible—that is to say, as soon as we can obtain from our present opponents the security that they will respect the lives, the persons, and the property of our subjects. I thank the House very sincerely for the patience with which they have listened to my statement—a statement which I have made with some difficulty—but I hope as far as it has gone it has proved satisfactory. I can only say that if further information be desired by any hon. Member I shall be happy to endeavour to afford it. The right hon. Baronet concluded by moving the following Resolutions:—

"1. That the total net revenues of the territories and departments under the immediate control of the Government of India for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £3,956,776 sterling, and the charges thereof, for the same period other than military charges, amounted to £3,208,118 sterling.

"2. That the total net revenues of the Bengal Presidency for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £11,662,738 sterling, and the charges thereof, for the same period, other than military charges, amounted to £2,513,263 sterling.

"3. That the total net revenues of the North Western Provinces for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £4,847,051 sterling, and the charges thereof, for the same period, other than military charges, amounted to £1,485,351 sterling.

"4. That the total net revenues of the Punjab for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £2,755,169 sterling, and the charges thereof for the same period, other than military charges, amounted to £1,096,999 sterling.

"5. That the total net revenues of the territories and departments under the immediate control of the Government of India, of the Bengal Presidency, of the North Western Provinces, and of the Punjab, together, for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £23,221,734 sterling, and the charges thereupon, including the military charges, amounted to £15,464,862 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the general charges of India of £7,756,872 sterling.

"6. That the total net revenues of the Madras Presidency (Fort St. George) for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £5,973,313 sterling, and the net charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,167,165 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the general charges of India, of £806,148 sterling.

"7. That the total net revenues of the Bombay Presidency for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £6,441,851 sterling, and the net charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,386,361 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the general charges of India, of £1,055,490 sterling.

"8. That the total net revenues of the several Presidencies for the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £35,636,898 sterling, and the charges thereof amounted to £26,018,388 sterling, leaving a surplus revenue of £9,618,510 sterling.

"9. That the interest on the registered debt of India, paid in the year ended the 30th day of April, 1864, amounted to £3,093,250 sterling, and the charges defrayed in England, on account of the Indian territory, in the same period, including interest on debt incurred in England, and guaranteed interest on the capital of railway and other companies, after deducting net traffic receipts of railways, amounted to £6,446,913 sterling, leaving a surplus of Indian income for the year ended as aforesaid, after defraying the above interest and charges, of £78,347 sterling."

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, it would conduce to the ease both of the Indian Minister and the House if, instead of making so detailed a statement of the Indian Budget, the right hon. Gentleman would lay upon the table a document resembling the *Exposé de l'Empire*, annually laid before the French Chambers, and containing authentic details, relative to the various departments of the Indian Government. Such a statement of accounts was actually provided for by Act of Parliament, and the right hon. Gentleman was violating the law by not giving it. With respect to the mode in which the Indian accounts were kept, he was glad to hear that gentlemen had been sent from the English Treasury. Lord Dalhousie had asked that these gentlemen should be sent out ten years ago, and it would have been much better if they had gone to India in 1854 instead of 1864. In April every year the Finance Minister of India came to the Indian Council and made his annual statement. It was generally an elaborate one, giving his motives for proposing various taxes, and containing an Estimate of the revenue and expenditure of the year. The right hon. Gentleman, however, steadily refused to lay the document before the House, although it was necessary to enable the House to understand the subject. The Finance Minister for India accompanied it by two estimates—one a Budget Estimate for the coming year, and the other a regular Estimate, giving the actual revenue and expenditure for eight months in the year that had elapsed, and showing how the figures agreed with the Budget Estimate. He regretted to see that according to the regular estimate of 1864-65 the land revenue had decreased by £218,000, compared with 1863-64. He observed also that there had been no receipts from the sale of waste lands in India. These might be made to bloom with cotton and other crops; why were they not sold? In opium there was a large increase. The military expenditure was £630,000 more than in 1863-64. One or two items of this increase were, no doubt, unavoidable; such, for instance, as the rations to soldiers owing to the increase in the price of the necessaries of life. With regard to other items he doubted whether a due regard to economy had been practised. There was an increase of £35,000 by the substitution of beer to a certain extent for spirits. This did not appear, according to another paper, to be the whole of the increase, and the change might have been effected at much less expense, by the establishment of English breweries on the spot, instead of the costly method of importation. The item of £57,000 for barrack furniture and gas for the soldiers' reading-rooms, and non-commissioned officers' rooms seemed enormous. The retention of two regiments that had been ordered home, was put down at £50,000. The expenditure on public works was estimated at £5,600,000. He saw it stated in every direction in the papers, that this expenditure was under no control, and that the Department was in a most disorganized state. There was an increase of £140,000 for gaols in Bengal alone. He had received complaints from jute manufacturers complaining that the Government were spending £10,000 in putting expensive machinery in the gaols for the manufacture of jute, which must soon be followed by the outlay of another £10,000 or £20,000 in order to enable the prisoners to compete with the labour outside the gaols. The Budget Estimate of 1864-65 assumed a surplus of £823,000, while the regular Estimate of the year showed a deficit of £344,000. The total Indian army was now costing us £15,700,000. There was another item in the Budget—an estimated expense of £10,000,000 for barracks for the European troops in India, although the Government had been spending money year after year in improving the present barracks. The question was whether 70,000 or 80,000 Europeans troops were required in India. During the troublesome times of the mutiny, and when the railways were less advanced, we had only 40,000 European troops in India, and yet they contrived to quell the mutiny. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend to keep the army in India at double its amount in 1857. If he did, no increase of revenue would meet so enormous a charge. The right hon. Gentleman also proposed to build a fleet of steam ships to carry his troops to India. If the troops were unnecessary, why build additional barracks, or provide new transports? [Mr. Vansittart: Are they unnecessary?] That was the question. How did the right hon. Gentleman intend to carry on the reliefs? The increase of the trade and prosperity of this country would make it more and more difficult to provide the number of troops. Then public works for the year 1865-66 were to cost £5,800,000, being an increase on the year of £200,000. The civil expenditure was £3,450,000, out of which the establishments would cost no less than £800,000 to dispense these £3,450,000. These figures gave some clue to the complaints in every Indian newspaper as to the extravagance with which the machinery of these civil departments was carried on. Then the education grant was constantly increasing. He would be the last to object to that were it not that nearly half the amount of the grant was swallowed up in the establishments. The total estimated expenditure was £47,186,000, and showed an increase over the expenditure of the preceding year of no less than £2,652,000. The Budget Estimate of the year—and they all knew how fallacious that Estimate was — reckoned on a deficiency of revenue. His right hon. Friend, however, had not told the House what steps he intended to take in order to force economy on the Government of India, and oblige them to make income and expenditure meet. And then as the waste lands were brought under cultivation, they did not appear to add anything to the revenue of the State. Some explanation was required, and some papers were necessary, to show what the facts of the case were. As to the mode in which this revenue was raised, he must comment upon what was called in India the "cowardly" policy whereby Sir Charles Trevelyan wished to replace the increased expenditure by imposing duties upon jute, which was a new manufacture in India, upon wool, which was a new product of commerce, and upon tea and coffee, which were taxed already, whilst he dared not tax cotton, out of regard for home interests. He regretted very much to see the income tax taken off, which, in five years, had produced nearly £8,000,000, and during all that time there was but one assessment, the assessment of the first year. India had so much benefited by the state of things in America, that, had there been an assessment lately, the tax would have been doubled, and he would suggest that it should be imposed in this form: exempt all incomes under £100 or £125 a year; and impose a tax of 3 per cent, realizing about 60 rupees, or £6 per annum, from incomes of £125 to £250; £12 from incomes of £250 to £500; and £25 on incomes from £500 to £1,000 a year. There might also be a license duty imposed on two or more classes on those following a trade or profession, excluding agriculturists, day labourers, and servants, and those who paid income tax. This was a tax in accordance with native feeling, and perhaps the only direct one that would be fairly paid. Before this expenditure of £10,000,000 was determined upon he would like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered the important question of the defence of India as a whole, in the best and cheapest manner, with the smallest number of troops? He should like to know whether his right hon. Friend had written out to India calling on the Government to reduce its enormous military expenditure? He should like to know whether his right hon. Friend, before sanctioning the enormous expenditure which it was proposed to make upon barracks, had read M. Brialmont's great work on fortifications and consulted the best authorities; for the problem was, how India was to be defended in the best manner? Another subject which was necessarily connected with the defence of India was, where they would have the capital? He had long considered there could be no doubt where it should be. For many reasons it should be at Bombay. Everybody admitted that Calcutta was too far to the east. The west was much better suited to European constitutions. Then Bombay was nearer Europe, it had a magnificent harbour, and its people were better adapted to receive European civilization. In short, all the social, commercial, and political requirements of the capital of India were fulfilled in the same city; and now that the Governor General and his Council were like a roving commission on the look-out for a capital, and constantly on the move, was the time to consider where the capital should be. Bombay was now really being re-built. The Government had gained a large sum of money by the sale of the waste lands there; and there could be no better time for establishing the seat of empire at Bombay. At present the Governor General and his council were compelled to go to the hills in the hot season, and for six months in the year the government of India was left practically in the hands of subordinate officers. If all the chief officers of State were in the interior, and not on a sea-board, and if they could not be communicated with easily, our empire in India would run great risk in the event of any such outbreak occurring as the mutiny of 1857. This question of the change of capital, therefore, ought to be taken into consideration speedily; and in his opinion but one decision could be arrived at. As to the inquiry in Oude, he did not wish to reflect in the least upon Sir John Lawrence, but must say, that remembering past passages in the history of the Viceroy, he greatly regretted that inquiry. The zemindars in Oude were naturally frightened in seeing the same machinery at work which had reduced their compeers in other portions of the country. One result of the system heretofore pursued in the North-West of India had been the utter uprooting of the native aristocracy; and some of our officials had reckoned it as great a feat to root out a zemindar as to kill a tiger. There were men whose position formerly was on a par with that of the highest aristocracy in England, who now, owing to our policy, were forced to beg their bread. But this policy of destroying the native aristocracy in the North-West Provinces for the benefit of the village proprietors had been a failure, for during the mutiny the ryots, the very men who should have been attached to our cause, had brought back the old aristocracy and replaced them in their feudal estates. He believed that only two things were requisite for the prosperity and contentment of India. One was that we should respect the systems we found existing there, and not endeavour to carry out theories of our own; and the other was to leave the religion of the natives entirely untouched. He should like to hear the views of his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Wood) with regard to the ecclesiastical establishments of India. Was it intended to divide the country into various bishoprics and to introduce the parochial system, defraying the cost of this out of Indian revenue? His hon. Friend had taken steps which justified apprehensions of this kind. Such a system should be nipped in the bud. In India we should carry out the plan which had been adopted in our colonies, and allow the grant of no money for ecclesiastical establishments of any kind. This policy was as desirable in the interests of Christianity as it was in the interests of British rule in India. He was pleased to hear that it was not intended to revert to Lord Dalhousie's system with regard to the native aristocracy of India, and he wished that his right hon. Friend would make a similarly satisfactory announcement with regard to religion. Just now the Indian Government were severing all connection with the native religions of India, and was this a time for using the money of Mahomedans and Hindoos in order to further Christianity? We had had a warning in the case of Ireland, and the thin end of the wedge should not be inserted in this direction. In his opinion such a system, if persisted in, would end disastrously for our rule in India.

Mr. VANSITTART said, the hon. Gentleman had deprecated a merely theoretical policy in India, but was, in fact, himself a great theorist. He had set down the number of European troops necessary in India at 40,000 and no more, because that was the number in the country at the time of the mutiny; but it was notorious that the Sepoys had taken advantage of the small number of Europeans then in the country to try to upset our rule. He was far from sharing the opinion of the hon. Gentleman on this point, and thought it was to be regretted that the right hon. Baronet had paid so little attention to the very earnest recommendation of Sir John Lawrence and his Council to raise a loan of ten millions, in order to construct new barracks and other military works which were urgently required for our European troops if we had the slightest regard for their health and safety. It appeared that for several reasons the Indian Government recommended that this outlay should not be charged to revenue. In the first place, they could hold out very little prospect of the revenue accounts for the next and following years being so elastic as the current year, although there was a deficit of £375,000. In reality it was £665,690; but it had been reduced to £375,000 by the right hon. Baronet delaying the construction of the transports to be built at home for the conveyance of our troops. In the second place, the Indian Government represented that the Bhootan war might be prolonged to an indefinite period owing to the difficulty in getting these savages to sue for peace; and as everything connected with that war has to be conveyed from a distance, it must necessarily be a costly one. Then, again, they had sold Government estates in Bengal and confiscated estates in the North-Western Provinces, which would not be available as a source of revenue in future years; and, lastly, £1,200,000 had been given up by the total remission of the income tax. He was aware that the right hon. Baronet had expressed his dissatisfaction that this tax was not renewed at the same rate as last year, but the right hon. Baronet quite forgot that the Indian Government had no alternative, for when Mr. Wilson imposed it he was obliged to assure the people of India that it should cease in five years—on the 31st of January, 1865. Mr. Laing reiterated this, and Sir Charles Trevelyan very properly remarked that—

> "At all hazards, we must try and keep faith with the people of India by not prolonging it, and the expiration of this tax will do more to secure the confidence of the people of India than anything else that could have happened."

The Indian Government gave another reason against the impolicy of making no provision to meet the deficit, and that was the uncertainty of the opium sales. The revenue to be derived from this source had been put down at £7,723,600, but during the last two years it had largely fallen short of the Estimates, and there was no security that this might not occur again. Further, the cash balances had fallen off from £19,000,000 to £11,000,000, notwithstanding the sale of a large amount of Government property. Probably English enterprize and capital had never been so profitably employed as at present. In proof of this it was only necessary to refer to the daily journals; scarcely a week elapsed without some new tea, coffee, or other scheme making its appearance. The remission, therefore, of the income tax would have been more than an equivalent, more than a compensation to the proprietors of those companies and the Indian public generally for the imposition of the export duties proposed to be levied by Sir Charles Trevelyan. Looking to these facts and the gloomy financial prospect before us, he was by no means disposed to think that the right hon. Baronet had acted wisely in reversing, in his usual summary off-hand manner, Sir Charles Trevelyan's financial arrangements — arrangements which had received not only the approval of Sir John Lawrence and his Council, but which after all, with reference to the peculiar local circumstances of the case, were about the best that could have been framed, and, at all events, they possessed the merit of balancing the income and expenditure. The effect, moreover, of this perpetual interference and snubbing on the part of the right hon Baronet could not fail to be attended with the worst results, for it would end by no one of any rank or position condescending to accept the office of Governor Generalship, with its large emoluments, if he was to be converted into a mere cipher. If report was to be believed, the evil had already shown itself, for it was said that Sir John Lawrence contemplated resigning. He complained, and justly so, that he possessed less independent authority now than when he was Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, and that, while all the responsibility and blame devolved upon him, the Secretary at home gained all the credit and glory. It was also very generally believed that that enlightened Governor, Sir Bartle Frere, was so mortified by the snubbing he received from the right hon. Baronet for the introduction of his liberal measures, that he had actually tendered his resignation. This was a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, and he hoped the new Parliament would, among its earliest acts, decide how India was to be governed in future—namely, in India or in England. Before he resumed his seat he begged to ask the right hon. Baronet if he had received Mr. Robert Cust's Report, or the Indian Government's despatch on that Report, relating to a scheme to reduce the salaries of the civilians of the North-Western Provinces? He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that that order had given rise to the same feeling of discontent as prevailed in the military and other services, and, it seemed, with great reason. The cost of the Indian Home Office amounted to £171,120 per annum. Every one connected with it, from the right hon. Baronet, the members of his Council, secretaries, clerks, and even those fifty porters and hall-keepers required to be employed in that overgrown, unwieldy establishment, were, one and all, in the receipt of handsome salaries. A Bill was passing through Parliament for augmenting the salaries of our County Court Judges, and another Bill giving handsome retiring pensions to our Colonial Governors. The Civil Service at home was well paid and possessed a well established superannuation system. The Government selected as their victims the actual rulers of India, a body of men who were striving conscientiously and indefatigably to perform their duties in that distant, unhealthful, and even deadly climate. This was done, too, in the very teeth of the recommendation of Sir Bartle Frere, the Governor of Bombay, who had lately sent home a Report that the cost of living in India was so enormous that it would be impossible for the officers, both civil and military, to continue on their present salaries.

MR. BUXTON said, he was sorry that the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) should have given countenance to the misapprehension which prevailed with regard to Sir Charles Trevelyan's proposals. The general idea appeared to be that Sir Charles Trevelyan had to deal with a failing income; that he nevertheless abolished the income tax, induced thereto by a supposed obstinate adherence to views expressed when he was Governor of Madras; and that, having created a deficiency, he sought to make it up by a loan and by the imposition of export duties on various Indian products. Nothing could be more unlike the truth than that representation. The fact was that the income of India for the ensuing year was calculated, after the abolition of the income tax, to be considerably greater than in the preceding year, and Sir Charles Trevelyan did not in his original scheme propose any export duties. The income of the ensuing year was calculated to produce more than the current expenditure, and but for the outlay on public works Sir Charles Trevelyan would have had a surplus. It was to meet the demand for public works that he proposed a loan, Sir Charles Trevelyan's view being that for reproductive public works it was right and wise, while paying the greater portion of the cost out of revenue, to meet some part of the expense by a small loan; and, in his financial statement, he observed—

> "It is true that the Ways and Means of the year are, to the extent of £1,200,000, composed of borrowed money. But this loan has nothing in common with the shifts and expedients of insolvent or embarrassed States. It is the result of a discriminating policy which confines taxation to its just objects, and provides by loan for reproductive works and for works of every kind which are on such a scale as would too severely strain the resources of a single generation. The best employment of money is that which the industrial classes make of their annual savings for their own sake, and it is no real advantage to the community to interfere seriously with this natural process and to cause general harassment and discontent in order to accelerate the execution of public works. Even if the condition of the finances were all that could be desired, it would still be expedient to limit taxation to the proper business

of Government, and to provide for reproductive works by means of specially appropriated funds." Sir Charles Trevelyan justly decided that this was a case for raising money partly by loan, and that he could drop the income tax and substitute a loan. He therefore adopted the principle proposed by the Government in the case of dockyard fortifications. Lord Macaulay had made the observation that nothing was so essential as that faith should be kept with the people of India. It was the idea of the people of that country that Mr. Wilson had pledged the Government to the abolition of the income tax, and in such a country, where the people were suspicious and jealous of the British tenure, it was of the highest importance that it should appear that the faith of the Government was maintained inviolate. There existed, then, a powerful inducement to do away with the income tax, which, besides, was demoralizing the people by causing them to resort to chicanery and cheating. Sir John Lawrence, disapproving the proposition to raise so much money as £1,200,000 by loan for public works, urged the imposition of export duties to the amount of £400,000, in order partly to recoup the temporary loss of the income tax, and his proposal was accepted by Sir Charles Trevelyan and the Council. These export duties had been much condemned in England, and he did not wish to defend them; but certainly in India they had not been looked upon as pernicious. There the whole scheme had been exceedingly approved, and especially by the Calcutta community; and it was thought they would operate only as a slight tax, falling principally on the European capitalists in that country, without interfering in any appreciable degree with the commerce of India. As to the army, he ventured, with the greatest diffidence, to think that we were keeping up an unnecessary amount of European force in that country. The late mutiny had been put down, as the hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) had reminded him, by little more than 12,000 European troops in the field, and since that period the power of the Government had been enormously increased. The artillery had been transferred to our own hands; the fortresses and strong places were now held by European soldiers; we had greatly reduced the Native army—the one enemy we had to fear; and railways, telegraphs, and an improved organization all contributed to augment the strength of the Government as compared with that of the Natives. The experience of the mutiny proved that we had no reason to apprehend a rising of the people, but only a revolt on the part of those whom we ourselves had armed. We had now, in fact, no enemy without, and none whom we need really dread within. We might, therefore, in his opinion, largely reduce our European force in India without endangering our power in that country, while we at the same time lessened the heavy drain upon the British army. In conclusion, he would only add that he had observed with much regret the evident pain and difficulty under which his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Wood) had made his statement—a statement as interesting and gratifying as any that he had ever heard in that House.

MR. BAZLEY said, he wished, in common with every Member of the Committee, to express his regret at the indisposition of his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles Wood) and his desire for his speedy recovery. Passing to the subject of his statement, he sincerely trusted that on another occasion they would be furnished with the Indian accounts at the commencement, instead of at the end of the Session. The question involved the welfare of 150,000,000 people, and the management of a revenue of £47,000,000, and, therefore, well deserved the earliest and most careful consideration of the House. There were many features of his right hon. Friend's statement which he could not regard with satisfaction. The financial affairs of India had not been placed before them in as clear and explicit a manner as could be wished. The Revenue Budget for 1865-6 amounted to £46,488,760, which, with the addition of the proposed loan of £1,200,000, made a total of £47,688,760. The estimated expenditure for the same year was stated thus:—In India, £40,469,540; in England, £6,717,390; making together £47,186,930; and then concluded with a surplus stated at £501,830, the total given being £47,688,760. Surely it was a gross inconsistency to be borrowing £1,200,000, with that apparent surplus of £501,830. He trusted that the Indian Department would direct its attention to that glaring discrepancy. The estimated sum required for the army and marine was £14,292,670; for public works for military purposes, £5,888,640; for law and justice, £4,942,650; for interest,

£3,201,820; the total sum expended in England was £6,717,390; and the sum set down to meet treaty engagements was £1,682,900; making together an expenditure of £36,726,160, against a revenue of £47,688,760. But, in addition to that expenditure, there was an item of no less than £8,642,569, for what was called "collections," or, in other words, an expense of nearly 20 per cent, which he thought enormous, was incurred in collecting the revenue, while there was still a further outlay under the head of "sundries" of £2,320,031. Now, he maintained that, with prudent and economical management, it would be necessary neither to borrow money nor to weaken our means of defence, nor to impose export duties. A large sum might easily be saved in conducting the business of India, without diminishing its efficiency, and, instead of requiring additional funds, a much smaller sum than the £6,000,000 now spent would amply suffice for all the public exigencies. They were about to build splendid offices in London, at the cost of the people of India—a very questionable proceeding indeed, and one that ought to be resisted. Something like £10,000,000 was proposed to be expended upon barracks and other conveniences for the army. That was an amount at the rate of £140 for every soldier, or, if divided also among the native army and police, it would give £30 for each individual. That was obviously a most extravagant outlay. When the Government spoke of executing public works they contemplated barracks and other accommodation for the troops, but very little, indeed, that was of a truly reproductive character and calculated to benefit the great mass of the people of India. In his Minute of the 30th of March, 1865, Sir John Lawrence said—

> "India is a vast continent, in which the amount of capital hitherto expended on public works, however considerable in amount, is quite insignificant compared with its wants."

The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles Wood) took credit for spending in six years £73,000,000 on public works in India, including railways; but in the present Session alone the Imperial Parliament had sanctioned undertakings the aggregate of whose capital was £126,000. Without more roads, railways, and means of irrigation, the trade and commerce of India must stagnate. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the cultivation of cotton, instead of grain, in India; but there was much more land under cultivation there than would be required if it were only cultivated at all as it should be. Instead of causing the poor Hindoo to starve, they should help to develop the resources of the soil. In the Marquess of Tweeddale's letter to Colonel Showers, dated June 21, 1865, which had been alluded to, there occurred this passage—

> "If we must look to India as the principal source of supply for cotton wool, we find three years of great demand, accompanied by high prices, have not had the effect of improving the length of the fibre or its substance. I therefore presume that there is no one in India who is competent for the undertaking. . . . . Surely in a country where no part of the produce of the soil is returned to the land, such as farmyard manure, it is more necessary that agricultural chymistry should supply the want, as cow-dung is used for fuel, and few horses or sheep are kept. India, therefore, requires a gardener."

Connected with the loan of £1,200,000, it was due to the Secretary of State for India to state that on the 9th of May last his right hon. Friend wrote in these terms—

> "You have not, however, continued the income-tax, producing upwards of £1,200,000 per annum, but you have proposed to raise a loan of precisely that amount, and to impose Customs duties of a most objectionable nature."

He was delighted with that statement, and he hoped it would be a motto in the India Office. He hoped that for the future the improvement of India would be carried out on *bonâ fide* capital, and that the country would be advanced by reproductive public works. He believed there was a great future for India, that she was capable of sending to this country comforts and raw materials which we needed; and that she might take in return those comforts with which England, better than any other country, could supply her. In conclusion, he wished his right hon. Friend health and strength to combat with the difficulties which he had to encounter in the administration of the affairs of India.

COLONEL SYKES said, he would be very glad if the prospects so satisfactory to his right hon. Friend should be realized; but to his mind, matters did not look hopeful when he found that there was scarcely a charge on the expenditure side of the account which had not been increased. As to the Estimate for 1865-66, he felt bound to say he did not place the slightest confidence in it. His right hon. Friend had given them ample proof that those prospective Estimates were not worth a rush. They were completely *in nubibus*. Such

Estimates varied in a year, as had been proved that night, from a surplus to a deficiency of £800,000. Again, looking to some of the items of the increased revenue, he regarded them as anything but satisfactory. For instance, there was an increase of £212,000 from abkaree, or, in other words, from the consumption of spirits. Now, that was scarcely desirable. There had been a decrease on the assessed taxes that was not satisfactory. Next, there was an increase of £600,000 from salt. This article was positively necessary for the people of India. If they did not consume it, from their vegetable diet they would be themselves consumed by worms. It was said that to tax beer in England was to tax the beverage of the working man; and certainly to tax salt in India was analogous to levying a tax on beer in England. Then there was an increase on opium, a drug which poisoned the people, and this was scarcely matter for congratulation. In Bengal the Government went the length of mixing itself up with the production of opium, by making advances to the producers in the first instance, and afterwards buying up the article, and this brought us into much odium. The large surplus anticipated by his right hon. Friend for the year 1863-64 had come down to £78,000, and this year not only was that £78,000 absorbed, but, in addition, the increased revenue. The increased expenditure in India demanded the earnest attention of his right hon. Friend, for its progress would be most embarrassing. The difference between the expenditure last year and the year before was upwards of £2,225,000. There was an increase in the civil branch of the Indian service, there was an increase in the home charges, and, in fact, in every branch they found an increase, and the increase for the police was worthy of observation. The Native veteran army of India had been reduced 135,000 men with a view to economy, leaving only 130,000 armed men to be paid; but it appeared by a Return to the House of Commons that the number of troops was 132,067, and of Native police 154,435—making a total of 286,502, so that there had actually been an increase of 165,000 armed men. And who were they? They consisted of undisciplined police, armed, dispersed throughout the country, having no European officers with the detached bodies, and at liberty to do just as they pleased. This had been the result of the reduction of the regular Native troops; they were increasing the number of armed men in the country—men dangerous from their want of discipline and utterly useless in the field. He had received information from an officer of experience in Central India, that in several instances it was suspected that atrocities had been committed by bands of police, who were without the discipline and control of European officers. Under these circumstances he could not say that the state of things in India had been improved. In fact, it was unsafe. A feeling was obtaining among those who were once native regulars—veterans—that their past services had been overlooked. Their old officers had been taken from them, and with those who were placed over them they had no sympathy, because they were strangers and had never served with them. The officers themselves were dissatisfied. Even the petted Staff Corps, the origin of all the confusion and wrong, were beginning to complain, and according to the testimony of a staff officer whose letter he held in his hand, and who spoke from personal experience, if some measures were not speedily adopted to remedy the present very unsatisfactory state of the service it would become completely disorganized, and the administration of the country would be rendered difficult. He entirely approved the course which had been taken by Sir Charles Trevelyan with regard to the income tax. A pledge had been given on the part of the Government that the income tax should continue for only five years, and Sir Charles Trevelyan only acted in the spirit of an English gentleman in fulfilling that pledge, not that he objected to an income tax which should touch the wealthy only. With respect to what had been said as to the zemindars being driven into beggary, he believed that many had fallen into difficulties by their foolish pride and pomp. They had got into debt, and the Government had sold their estates because they did not pay the Government land tax. The result was beggary, but it did not arise from granting proprietary rights to the cultivators. There were several other topics on which he had intended to touch, but, in the absence of a quorum, he would not detain the Committee. He could not sit down, however, without entreating his right hon. Friend to look seriously on the state of feeling in India, and especially to reflect on the uncertainty of the opium revenue and the impolicy of any increase in the salt tax.

Mr. KINNAIRD, thought that the Secretary for India was placed in a most unenviable position. First, he was found fault with for not doing something, and then, when he had sought to remedy the evil complained of, he was abused and virtually told that he had better have done nothing. His hon. Friend who had just sat down complained of the increase of the police and of their being armed. Some years ago he remembered bringing before the House the need there was for an increase. With regard to their being armed, he believed when they were so it was exceptional, and that ordinarily they were not so. Again, an accusation had been brought against the Governor General, Sir John Lawrence, on account of the inquiry he had instituted in Oude into the rights of the under tenantry; and it was said that he wished to destroy the aristocracy as he had done in the Punjab. That he had not done anything to forfeit the confidence of the talookdars and other large landholders was evidenced by the late Durbar, the success of which was a sufficient reply to such accusations. Again, with regard to the army, one would have thought from the observations then made that there was a proposal greatly to increase it, whereas, the fact was, that the Secretary for India had reduced it by two regiments and a battery of artillery. He thought that the Government might be congratulated on the condition of India under many of its aspects, and he was glad that a policy of protection, or restriction on trade, had not been sanctioned. The testimony of facts proved that free trade was a permanent source of wealth, whatever apparent or temporary advantages might result to the revenue from an opposite course. He was also bound to express his satisfaction at the wise view adopted by the Government with respect to the land question, and that, while maintaining a native aristocracy as necessary for India, they at the same time were determined to uphold the rights of the peasantry, and give them that security of tenure which must be at the base of all improvement, social and moral—the more liberal construction placed upon the grant in aid system, by which the cause of education had been advanced showed the progressive spirit that had animated the councils and the legislation for India during the past year. He trusted that, by the development of public works, by the progress of enlightened education, India might rapidly advance both socially and morally, and that by contact with the Christian faith of this land the natives of India might be induced more and more to examine the foundations of that faith, so as to embrace it for themselves.

Mr. W. EWART said, he thought that a printed statement of the affairs of India should be prepared annually and placed in the hands of Members of that House.

Sir CHARLES WOOD said, with regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Poole on the disposition of troops in India, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that the subject of disposing the troops in such a manner that the smallest number could be made most available had been very seriously considered by the authorities in India for the last three or four years, and the position of the barracks in each Presidency had been determined partly by this consideration and partly by that of the healthiness of the site. With regard to the reduction of troops, that was a subject on which the authorities in India were the best judges. As he was blamed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poole for having too many troops, and by the hon. Member for Windsor for having too few, probably he had hit somewhere about the happy medium. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member for Poole, who had been Secretary to the Board of Control, talk about our establishing an ecclesiastical establishment there. The hon. Gentleman must know that the principle on which clergymen were sent out to India was that of military chaplains. When a large body of servants of the State, whether civil or military, were sent out to a country where the whole population is Mahomedan, Hindoo, or heathen, it was not unreasonable that we should send out clergymen to minister to their spiritual wants, as we sent out medical men to administer to their bodily ailments. And when we sent out a number of clergymen we sent Bishops out to look after them, as when we sent out a number of surgeons a certain number of Inspectors General were sent to look after them. The hon. Gentleman opposite said that the Home Government had so constantly interfered with Sir John Lawrence that he had offered to resign. He did not know where the hon. Gentleman had got his information, and it was certainly a remarkable time to make the statement when the Home Government had been steadily supporting him against his Council. Sir John Lawrence had said that the income tax ought to have been continued, and the Home Government said he was quite right. He was glad to have the opportunity of contradicting the statement. He had no reason whatever to believe that Sir John Lawrence was anything but perfectly satisfied with his position in India, and he had received undeviating support from home. There was an advantage derived from the visits to Simla by the Governor General, that they were less expensive and less inconvenient than to the tours which it had been formerly the custom to make. The hon. Gentleman had said that Sir Bartle Frere was dissatisfied with his treatment, but that statement did not accord with what he had heard from a dear connection of his, who had been assured by an equally near connection of Sir Bartle Frere that he fully appreciated the kindness and courtesy he had received from himself. The hon. Gentleman also asked, whether a memorandum had been received concerning a reduction of salaries? No such memorandum, he believed, had been received, although the subject had been referred to in a private letter from Sir John Lawrence. There was no intention of adopting so unfortunate a system as that of under-paying public servants in that distant country. The hon. Member for Manchester had referred to the expense of collecting the Revenue in India; but if the hon. Gentleman had looked at the finance accounts which were on the table of the House, he would have seen that the expense of collection was, in the case of the land tax, 10 per cent; assessed taxes, 3 per cent; customs 7 per cent; salt duty, 6 per cent; and stamps, 6 per cent. [Mr. Bazley: Opium.] No doubt upon opium the cost of collection was 33 per cent, that tax was of an anomalous character, and ought not to be taken as an element of calculation in estimating the average cost of collection of other taxes. There were strong objections to the tax, but unless any one could point to any other source whence £8,000,000 a year could be obtained, he feared the tax must be continued. The hon. Gentleman also referred to the £126,000,000 voted this year for new railways in this country; but probably all that amount would not be expended. Those railways were private undertakings, and he (Sir Charles Wood) had only referred to public works in India, and was unable to give an account of the works resulting from private enterprize in that country. The hon. Gentleman had also read a passage from a letter from the Marquess of Tweeddale referring to the want of manure. In India that was a great want, because the people in many parts of the country used for fuel the only manure they possessed. The hon. Member for Aberdeen had alluded to what he conceived to be the falling off in the proceeds from the land revenues and assessed taxes, but those apparent diminutions were the result of exceptional gains in former years. The increase in the amount derived from the salt tax was not a proof of additional burdens upon the people of India, but was evidence of increased comfort and wealth, and the greater quantity of salt carried up the country by the railroads. With respect to the additional number of armed men referred to by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, the answer was that the 281,000 men of the police thus referred to were not armed men. The police did not in most cases carry arms. They were scattered all over the country. There was a vast difference between a scattered unarmed body of police and a well-disciplined, well-armed Native army, and no danger could be apprehended from the former. In conclusion, the right hon. Baronet thanked the Committee for its consideration towards him, and hoped that the statement he had made would prove generally satisfactory.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

1. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounting to £3,956,776 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £3,208,118 sterling.

2. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Bengal Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £11,662,738 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £2,513,263 sterling.

3. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the North Western Provinces, for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £4,847,051 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,485,351 sterling.

4. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Punjab, for the year ended on the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £2,755,169 sterling, and the Charges thereof, for the same period, other than Military Charges, amounted to £1,096,999 sterling.

5. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments under the immediate control of the Government of India, of the Bengal Presidency, of the North Western Provinces, and of the Punjab, together, for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £23,221,734 sterling, and the Charges thereupon, including the Military Charges, amounted to £15,464,862 sterling, leaving a surplus available for the general Charges of India, of £7,756,872 sterling.

6. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Madras Presidency (Fort Saint George), for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £5,973,313 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,167,165 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the General Charges of India, of £806,148 sterling.

7. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the Bombay Presidency, for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £6,441,851 sterling, and the net Charges thereof, for the same period, amounted to £5,386,361 sterling, leaving a surplus available in the above Presidency, for the General Charges of India, of £1,055,490 sterling.

8. *Resolved,* That the total net Revenues of the several Presidencies, for the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £35,636,898 sterling, and the Charges thereof amounted to £26,018,388 sterling, leaving a surplus Revenue of £9,618,510 sterling.

9. *Resolved,* That the Interest on the Registered Debt of India, paid in the year ended the 30th day of April 1864, amounted to £3,093,250 sterling, and the Charges defrayed in England, on Account of the Indian Territory, in the same period, including Interest on Debt incurred in England and Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, after deducting net Traffic Receipts of Railways, amounted to £6,446,913 sterling, leaving a surplus of Indian Income for the year ended as aforesaid, after defraying the above Interest and Charges, of £78,347 sterling.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Nine o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, June 30, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) (225); Penalties Law Amendment (178).

Select Committee—Report—Harwich Harbour* (197)

Committee—Crown Suits, &c.* (187); Expiring Laws Continuance* (226); Poor Law Board Continuance* (227); Colonial Docks Loans* (231); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (232); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (223); Land Debentures* (112).

Report — Crown Suits, &c.* (187); Expiring Laws Continuance* (226); Poor Law Board Continuance* (227); Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment* (200); Colonial Docks Loans* (231); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (232); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (223).

Third Reading — Prisons* (228); Greenwich Hospital* (179); Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment* (229); Fire Brigade (Metropolis)* (215); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (216); Ayr Burghs Election* (186); Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit* (212); Inland Revenue* (221); Indemnity* (222); Compound Spirits Warehousing* (224), and *passed.*

COLONIAL GOVERNORS (RETIRING PENSIONS) BILL—(No. 225.)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that its object was to enable the Government to grant retiring pensions to our Colonial Governors at the expiration of a stated period of service. These officials, he might observe, were public servants who had to perform arduous duties away from their own country, and often under the influence of bad climates. It had been deemed undesirable to make a charge for such a pension on any particular colony, and the proposal, therefore, was to grant retiring pensions to the Governors of Colonies in accordance with the importance of the post which each had happened to fill, based upon the general principle by which the pensions of other civil servants of the Crown were regulated.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl de Grey and Ripon.*)

The Earl of HARDWICKE said, he did not rise for the purpose of criticising the Bill, but for another purpose, which he would shortly mention. No doubt the Bill itself was in theory perfectly just. It declared that Colonial Governors who served Her Majesty for a certain time should be dealt with as public servants usually were who served their country faithfully and usefully. But the Bill had this remarkable feature—that it was in the discretion of the Minister to grant a pension or not. If the Minister considered that the public servant was not precisely a person whom he desired to reward, however valuable might have been his services, he had nothing whatever to do than to dismiss him

Sir Charles Wood

after nine or sixteen years' services, according to the particular circumstances of the case, as provided for under this Bill, and thereby deprive him of all chance of a pension. He (the Earl of Hardwicke), however, made those observations only by way of passing comment on the provisions of the Bill—if he had not another purpose in view he should not have risen on the present occasion. Their Lordships would remember that in the course of the last Session he had presented a petition from a highly honourable and distinguished gentleman bearing upon this subject. Being aware that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce such a Bill as the present into Parliament, this eminent gentleman ventured to express a hope that his services would be taken into consideration. He (the Earl of Hardwicke) had no hesitation in saying, after careful consideration, that this gentleman stood in a position second to none in regard to services rendered to the British Empire. The services rendered by Sir Francis Head were of the most valuable character. Sir Francis Head, in consequence of circumstances to which he would not then allude, had, however, been passed over without any substantial recognition of his services. That high-minded and honourable man had nevertheless borne this neglect and inattention with the greatest fortitude—the feeling uppermost in his mind being that, notwithstanding the services he had rendered to his Sovereign and his country, he had been a forgotten man. On the occasion to which he (the Earl of Hardwicke) had alluded Sir Francis Head thought it a fair opportunity of presenting himself to the notice of the British Legislature for the purpose (in his old age and being a poor man) of asking for some solid pecuniary remuneration under the circumstances of Her Majesty's Government being about to introduce a Bill into Parliament empowering them to grant pensions to retiring Colonial Governors. The claim of Sir Francis Head was, however, refused. Now the character of this gentleman was, after all, but little known to the public. A more independent or honourable man did not exist. He (the Earl of Hardwicke) would have the honour of showing that that same character which eminently distinguished him through his official life he maintained to the last. Sir Francis Head had requested him to read to their Lordships a short letter which would relieve Her Majesty's Government from any further notice of his case. That letter was as follows—namely,

"Croydon, 26th June, 1865.

"My dear Lord Hardwicke,—Among the Royal prerogatives it was once my duty to defend, there is no one I more ardently desire to uphold than that which decrees that a reward for public services shall descend only through the Ministers of the Crown. And as Her Majesty's Government, in the exercise of this prerogative, have expressed themselves adverse to the prayer of my memorial (printed last Session by order of both Houses of Parliament), it is clearly my duty to submit without remonstrance or complaint to their decision. I therefore request that on the introduction to the House of Lords of the 'Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill,' you will be pleased to abstain from any further reference to my bygone services in Canada.

"Believe me to remain yours very faithfully,

"F. B. HEAD."

THE EARL OF DERBY considered that this measure was one of simple justice, and one which had been too long delayed. During the experience he had had in the Colonial Office many grievous cases had come under his notice of Colonial Governors being compelled to retire from office, after performing valuable services, without any pension whatsoever being granted them. As a general rule he observed that Colonial Governors retired, not only without any proper remuneration for their services, but they were placed in a much worse position than that which they occupied before they accepted office. The inflexible rule was that no outfit was provided for a Colonial Governor, who was therefore compelled to go out to the colony after incurring an expense equal to about one and a half year's salary as Governor; and if by any accident he was compelled to resign before he had served eighteen months in his new office he not only received no remuneration but he was actually at a pecuniary loss in consequence of the expenses of his outfit. The Bill unfortunately came before their Lordships at such a time as to render them unable to deal with its provisions, otherwise there were some details to which he should certainly have taken exception as hardly carrying out the principle on which the measure had been framed; but he thoroughly approved the scope of the measure, which did tardy justice to a class of men who rendered valuable services to the State. He was not aware that his noble Friend near him (the Earl of Hardwicke) intended to advert to the particular services of Sir Francis Head. He could understand the difficulty of including his case within the operation of this Bill in consequence of the short period he had served as Colonial Governor. He, however, entirely concurred in the estimate given by his noble Friend of the services and character of Sir Francis Head. Those services were the more valuable, inasmuch as they were rendered at a time of great and peculiar difficulty, and there could be no denying the fact that Sir Francis Head had been mainly instrumental in saving Canada—he could use no less forcible an expression—to this country. Notwithstanding such distinguished services, he must say that Sir Francis Head, upon his return to this country, did not meet with that consideration and fair dealing for the discharge of a very unpopular duty to which he was fairly and honourably entitled. But the case of that gentleman was a much harder one than even that which had been stated, because Sir Francis Head had actually sacrificed a permanent appointment to accept the Governorship of Canada; and when he returned to this country he was not only refused a retiring allowance, but he was denied the office which he before filled, and which, if he had not resigned it, he would be entitled to hold for life. Sir Francis Head therefore now remained, he (the Earl of Derby) would not say, a discontented man, but certainly a man suffering from a strong sense that his services had not received the reward to which they were justly entitled. He confessed he thought Sir Francis Head a hardly used man. Having made those observations, he only wished to express in general terms his entire concurrence in the principle of this Bill. He believed that Parliament was at last about to award a certain amount of justice to a most deserving class of men who were generally taken from the Civil Service to discharge the responsible functions of Colonial Governor.

Lord LYVEDEN agreed that it was impossible to deal with the case of Sir Francis Head under this Bill, but he thought that the Government might propose to give him some compliment or remuneration for the gallant and worthy services which he rendered in Canada. With reference to the Bill itself, he should have been glad to see the period of service after which a Governor might retire shortened. He held that the colonies ought to pay all expenses which were properly chargeable to them, but he did not think — and the late Sir William Molesworth was of the same opinion — that the pensions, nor indeed the salaries, of Governors ought to be charged to the colonial revenues.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

PENALTIES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(NO. 178.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY *moved* the second reading of this Bill, the object of which was to re-apportion the terms of imprisonment in cases where the fines were not paid. The relative periods of imprisonment were, for any penalty not exceeding 10*s*., seven days; exceeding 10*s*. and not exceeding £1, fourteen days; exceeding £1 but not exceeding £2, one month; and exceeding £2 but not exceeding £5, two months.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Lord CHELMSFORD said, he had no objection to the Bill so far as it went, but he thought their Lordships should take the whole subject into their consideration with a view to its improvement. There were certain alterations in the Bill which he thought it would be desirable to make when the Bill was in Committee.

Lord REDESDALE said, this was one of those Bills which were introduced on account of some particular case of hardship. One or two instances would occur in which persons were sentenced to a few days' more imprisonment than perhaps would have met the justice of the case; then the Government were memorialized, and a Bill was introduced into Parliament. He believed the magistrates throughout the country exercised the greatest discretion in apportioning the amount of the fines and the terms of imprisonment, and therefore this Bill, by depriving the magistrates of their discretion, would do more harm than good. He objected altogether to legislation on this system, and therefore hoped their Lordships would refuse to pass this Bill.

Lord DENMAN said, that this Bill was intended to remedy the discrepancy in the punishment of drunkenness contained in the Wine Licences and Refreshment Act, which empowered magistrates to imprison for drunken and riotous conduct, without a fine, for seven days; or, if a fine of not exceeding 40*s*. were inflicted, to imprison for not exceeding three months in default of payment. The cases, however, were so frequent against the same offenders that the longer term of imprisonment did not seem to be too severe; and in awarding the fine the magistrates (for whom he felt great respect) were careful to proportion the fine to the circumstances of the defendant. He felt sure that abridging the discretionary powers of the magistrates would make them more and more unwilling to act. He wished that in Committee a power might be inserted to imprison for drunkenness for twelve hours in some local Bridewell approved of by the magistrates, for which there was a Statute applicable to Ireland. Prisoners were often sent for seven days to a prison distant thirty miles in England.

EARL GRANVILLE remarked that the House was not in Committee.

LORD DENMAN replied that time was often saved by suggestions being made beforehand.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, he could not see what objection there could be to deprive the magistrates of the power of inflicting terms of imprisonment beyond those which would be sufficient to meet the justice of the cases.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

PUBLIC MUSEUMS, &c.

PETITIONS FOR OPENING IN EVENINGS.

LORD EBURY, in *presenting* a Petition of Patrons, Presidents, and Officers of the Early Closing Association, and of Working Men of Islington, for the Opening of Public Museums, &c., in the Evenings, for the Benefit of the Working Classes, praying that the recommendation of the Committee of 1860 might be carried into effect in reference to the opening of the British Museum and other National Collections three evenings in the week betwen the hours of seven and ten o'clock, said, that the Petition was signed by two right rev. Prelates and a number of noblemen and gentlemen, who were, in fact, the authors of the early closing movement, and its prayer was that the Public Museums, such as the National Gallery and the British Museum, should be open three evenings in the week, in order that persons whose employments allowed them no other opportunities might be able to enjoy the benefits of those collections. Their Lordships, he was sure, would be among the first to appreciate the benefits of early closing, and since Parliament had declared that it would not take any step to open these Museums on Sundays they were in duty bound to attend to the prayer of the Petitioners, and endeavour to give them an opportunity to visit the Museums in the evening. He wished to ask his noble Friend the President of the Council whether the Government, or those persons who had the requisite authority, could hold out any hope that the reasonable request of the Petitioners would be complied with.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that in the only Museum with which he was connected —the South Kensington Museum—steps had been taken to open it in the evening. Further alterations, however, in lighting and in ventilation were necessary before the experiment could be said to be successful. Large numbers of persons had partaken of this privilege, the greater portion of whom were composed of artizans and working men from all parts of the metropolis. With regard to the National Gallery, Sir Charles Eastlake had informed the Government that no answer could be given at present, as the matter was still before the Trustees. As to the British Museum, Mr. Panizzi had informed him that the subject had been frequently considered by the Trustees, that Mr. Braidwood, the late Superintendent of the Fire Brigade, had been consulted, who expressed his opinion that the risk from the gas and other lighting arrangements necessary to open the museum in the evening would be very great. Considering the valuable contents of the Museum great care and consideration ought to be exercised before any such risk was run. This objection was entirely independent of the increased cost caused by the increased staff which would be necessary, which, of course, would not weigh against a commensurate advantage to the public.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND said, that in several foreign Museums no light was ever allowed to be used.

EARL STANHOPE said, as one of the Trustees of the British Museum, he was able to state that the question of opening the Museum at night had been several times under the consideration of the Trustees. The object was very desirable, but the objection with regard to the risk by fire was represented to them to be very considerable. It, however, remained to be considered whether by any means that danger could be effectually averted. Besides the question of risk from fire, there was the question of expense. The object could not be carried out, as their Lordships must perceive, without a considerable increase of the Estimate. There must be a considerable addition to the present number of attendants, or the present attendants must be paid a proportionate increase for the extra labour that would be cast upon them.

LORD EBURY thought there would be no detriment to the pictures in the National Gallery from their being shown by gaslight. The pictures in the Academy had been shown in the evening, and no complaints had been made.

EARL STANHOPE said, that the pictures at the Academy were only shown for a portion of the year, and as the time was so short the gaslight did not prove prejudicial; but if the pictures in the National Gallery were thrown open they would be subjected to the same influences year after year, so that no decisive argument could be drawn in the one case from what had happened in the other.

Petitions to lie on the table.

ISSUE OF ARMY COMMISSIONS.
QUESTION.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, he wished to ask a Question of the noble Earl the Secretary for War respecting the preparation and issue of Army Commissions. Many complaints had been made upon the subject, but he would state some circumstances that had occurred to himself. On the 31st of May, 1865, there was delivered at his house his commission as colonel in the army, dated July, 1855. That commission bore the counter signature of General Peel, who quitted office in 1859, and therefore its preparation must have been complete six years ago. Upon the back of the commission were some pencil marks which, however necessary it might be to make during the passage of the Commission through the offices, ought not to be allowed to remain upon a document which bore upon it Her Majesty's signature. On the 1st of June he received another commission, addressed to the late Earl of Longford, who died in 1859. He scarcely knew what to do with that commission; but, upon the whole, he thought the best course would be to return it to the War Department before the financial officer called, as no doubt he would do, for the stamp duty on it. While speaking of the stamp duty, he might mention that on the 7th of May, 1863, he had been obliged to send a remonstrance to the War Office against being called upon for stamp duty which had already been paid. In reply, he had received a letter expressing the regret of the noble Earl opposite that a mistake should have occurred. He had consulted a friend as to what he should do in respect of the commissions which had just been sent to him, and he was advised to wait a few days to see whether any more were sent. He acted on that advice; but had not long to wait, for on the 2nd of June there came to him two other commissions, one dated July, 1855, signed by General Peel, and the other dated 1857. It appeared from those circumstances that delay was the rule of the office, and therefore he wished to have some explanation of its causes. He did not desire to make any personal complaint, but simply brought the matter forward that it might receive such attention as it might deserve. Commissions lost much of their value when they were only issued years after they had been gazetted. He wished to ask, Under what Arrangements the Commissions of Officers are prepared and issued by the War Department?

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, he would first explain what were the existing arrangements for the issue of commissions, and would next notice the particular circumstance of the noble Earl's case, but he could only do so generally, as the noble Earl had given him no notice of his intention to introduce the particular instances he had referred to. The practice was that as soon as an officer was gazetted for promotion or appointment steps were taken for the preparation of his commission. The commission was not generally issued for some time, but was retained in case of any alteration being found to be necessary. It was not issued to the officer until the stamp duty had been paid upon it. That duty ought to be paid out of the first pay receivable by the officer; and as soon as the War Office found from the quarterly accounts that the stamp duty had been paid the commission ought to be issued. That was the present rule, and he trusted that it would be strictly adhered to in future. The noble Earl had adverted to delays which had taken place in the issue of commissions, and had referred to his own case. Such delays had arisen from two causes—slackness in the payment of the stamp duties and a pressure upon the Office. The matter had been brought under the notice of successive Secretaries for War; and when General Peel was in office he took measures to enforce the payment of the stamp duty, and later, Sir George Lewis laid down the rules now in force for immediate payment. There had, however, arisen from various causes large arrears in the issue of commissions, and in 1862 an Act was passed altering the mode of signing such documents. After the passing of that Act, Sir George Lewis proceeded to sign commissions, and he (Earl de Grey) followed the example; but he found that the number of unissued commissions was so large that, if extra efforts to sign them were not made, they would not be issued for several years. Last year, in October and November, he had signed about 14,000 commissions, but this unfortunate result had followed from his zeal, that with this large mass of documents all signed at one time, there came a pressure on the branch of the department which issued them, and consequently there had been a certain amount of delay in sending them out. These facts would explain how it was that the noble Earl had received several commissions about the same time. The delays, however, had now ceased, and he hoped that in future commissions would be issued within three months of the promotion and appointment being gazetted. With proper precautions there could arise no future arrears. He would, however, venture to ask the noble Earl whether he could say that his commission had not been lying in the hands of his agents—for such cases had frequently happened?

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE said, he could not conceive anything more absurd than that an officer of the army should be commissioned to do certain acts and perform certain duty without the commission having been placed in his hands before he was called upon to do those acts and discharge that duty. In the navy this was not the case; and he hoped it would cease to be the practice in the army.

THE EARL OF DERBY suggested that there was a part of the noble Earl's (Earl de Grey and Ripon) explanation which required to be explained. The noble Earl had stated that in some instances the commissions remained unissued from the slackness of the officers in paying the stamp duty; but almost in the same sentence he had observed that the stamp duty was deducted from the first payment made to the officer.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, that the deduction to which he had referred, and which, he might observe, had been adopted only recently, was made by the agent and not by the War Office.

CLAIMS OF MR. JACKSON.—QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government will consent to lay upon the table of the House the Papers in the Foreign Office relating to the claims of Mr. Jackson on the Russian Government? In making the brief statement which would explain this case, he regretted to be called on to say anything which would imply the slightest doubt of the good faith of the Russian Government in its dealings with British subjects; because he must see that in all his experience of transactions in which the Russian Government had been mixed up, either while he was residing in Russia as a public servant, or at any other time, he had found that Government to act in a most just, proper, and, he would add, liberal manner. The consequence of such a policy was that Russia was able to obtain the advantage of British capital, enterprize, and skill whenever she required such assistance. Naturally attracted by such circumstances, Mr. Jackson had entered into a contract with a Russian company for the construction of a certain length of railway, and embarked large sums in carrying out that contract. However, when the contract came to an end he found himself in a dispute with the company, from whom he demanded a sum of money which they refused to pay. Mr. Jackson had no claim, and did not pretend to have any claim, against the Russian Government; but, inasmuch as that Government had guaranteed the means of completing the railway, and made itself responsible for the payment of a dividend to the shareholders, no matter what might be the profits of the line as a mercantile speculation, when the company repudiated his claim he applied to the Russian Government to stop its pecuniary assistance to the line until his claim should have been inquired into and satisfied. The justness and fairness of that claim had been admitted by persons of the highest respectability and denied by none, and Lord Napier, our Minister at St. Petersburg, had made representations on the subject to the Russian Government. The reply of the latter was, that if Mr. Jackson failed to obtain justice from the company he should go to a Court of Law. That would be a very good answer in such a case in this country; but any one acquainted with the proceedings of Courts of Justice in Russia would see that in an action at law a British subject would have very little chance in one of those courts against a powerful Russian company. Moreover, there were technical difficulties in this particular case. He thought there had been something like a denial of justice to Mr. Jackson; and believing that it was desirable to have the papers before their Lordships, he asked his noble Friend whether he would produce them?

EARL RUSSELL said, it appeared to him that Mr. Jackson's claim was a private one, in which Parliament could not properly interfere, and that there would be no public advantage in laying the papers on their Lordships' table. He thought that when Mr. Jackson was entering into the contract he ought to have taken care that he would be able to make good his claim against the company. He now complained that there were certain sums of money owing to him, and he had applied to Her Majesty's Government to interfere with the Government of Russia. Her Majesty's Government had given orders to our Ambassador at St. Petersburg to interfere so far as his good offices might go. The answer of the Russian Government appeared to him to be a reasonable one. They said they were bound to pay interest to the shareholders of the company, and that they could not do otherwise except by order of a Court of Law; and in order to make good his claim Mr. Jackson was referred to legal tribunals of the country. This seemed to him (Earl Russell) the proper course to take in questions of this nature. Under these circumstances, he must decline to produce the papers.

CAPTAINS ON THE RESERVED LIST.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD CHELMSFORD, in rising to call the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to Claims of Captains on reserved half-pay under the Orders in Council of the 25th of June, 1851, and the 30th of January, 1856, said, the Order of 1851 stated among other things that, while the Lords of the Admiralty had recommended the abandonment of brevet promotion in future, they were nevertheless desirous of giving consideration to the claims of those officers who looked to their promotion as the reward of their past services more than in the expectation of future employment. In order, at the same time, not to fill the active list with officers who could not long continue fit for service, their Lordships had determined to promote by selection a certain number of commanders to the rank of captains, who would be placed upon half-pay. Under the system of brevet promotion, for which these officers were no longer eligible, they would in the natural course of things have advanced to 12*s.* 6*d.*, 14*s.* 6*d.*, and ultimately 25*s.* a day. If, however, this Order in Council were construed, as it unfortunately appeared to be, these officers would receive 10*s.* 6*d.* a day, and be eligible for no further promotion or increase of pay, and such an arrangement it would be almost a mockery to term a reward for long and faithful services. Certainly every one of the officers who acceded to the arrangement, as set forth in the Order of Council of 1851, did so under the impression that they were eligible for service in case of emergency, and that they would still receive all the advantages which they would have derived under the system of brevet promotion. In this opinion, too, they were naturally confirmed by the form of the commission which they received, because that commission was that of a captain on the active list. When some of these officers tendered themselves for active service they were not informed that they were not eligible, but simply that the naval warfare carried on was not such as to require their services. These officers remained under the impression from 1851 to 1859 that they had forfeited none of the advantages which they would have otherwise enjoyed from being placed on the reserved half-pay list; but in 1859, in answer to an application by one of those officers for an increase of 2*s.* a day, which would naturally have fallen to him, he was informed that he was no longer entitled to it. That statement excited the utmost surprise and consternation among these officers, eighty-nine of whom signed a memorial on the subject. Seven additional names came in afterwards, making ninety-six, there being only 100 officers on the list. In the Order of Council of 1851, which conferred the supposed advantages which he had mentioned upon the officers in question, there was a paragraph to the effect that the number of commanders on the active list would be reduced to a number not exceeding 450, by placing on reserved half-pay all commanders who had not served afloat or in the packet or revenue services within twenty years, or who were physically incapable of serving, and by continuing from time to time to remove such officers from the active to the reserved half-pay list. It was added that those thus placed on the latter list "shall be allowed to enjoy all the advantages they now enjoy of rising in pay and rank." He did not know whether the attention of the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) had been called to that portion of the Order in Council, but it appeared to him to be decisive with regard to the claims which he was advocating. It was but fair to state that in the year 1860 each of the captains on the reserved list who had served not less than fifteen years was to be entitled to 2*s.* a day additional pay, and that that afforded some evidence of the existence of a feeling that injustice had been done; but the redress given for that injustice was, at the same time, very insufficient, because the highest pay to which those officers could, under that Order in Council, attain was 16*s.* 6*d.*, whereas if they had been treated properly they would have been on the reserved list of Admirals, and have been in the receipt of 25*s.* a day. But the noble Duke would, no doubt, ask what remedy was to be applied in the case. He believed that remedy was very easy. The list of which he was speaking was now closed, and it contained many officers who were advanced in life. A sum of £2,000 a year, would, therefore, so far as he could ascertain, satisfy the claims for which he was contending, and the demand, it should be borne in mind, was one which would be likely to diminish from year to year. There was no good reason, then, as far as he could see, why the noble Duke should hesitate to do that which after all was but a simple act of justice.

THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY thanked his noble and learned Friend for having so clearly brought the claims of those deserving officers before the House. He thought a great injustice had been done them. He hoped the Admiralty — especially taking into account the small sum which would be required to satisfy their demand — would reverse its former decisions in their regard.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, that the subject now brought before their Lordships by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Chelmsford) had been a frequent subject of discussion in the other House of Parliament. The present Board of Admiralty were not responsible for the Orders in Council to which the noble and learned Lord had called attention. As regarded the terms of the commission, it was true that the commission granted to the first eleven officers who were placed upon this list were the same as those of officers upon the active list; but the error was discovered, and in all future commissions the words "on the reserve half-pay list" were added. The observations of the noble and learned Lord upon this part of the subject would, therefore, apply only to the case of the eleven officers who were first placed upon this list. The question really was, were the officers deceived by the Order in Council, or did they, when they accepted this retirement, know what they were doing? In 1856 an officer wrote to the Admiralty a letter, which had since been laid upon their Lordships' table, asking whether if he accepted reserved rank he would afterwards rise in pay. The answer of the Admiralty was clear and decisive, that he would not be entitled to any increase of half-pay. That reply was sure soon to become pretty well known throughout the service, and therefore since 1856 none of these officers could have expected that their half-pay would increase. Sir Francis Baring, who was First Lord of the Admiralty in the year 1851, when this mode of retirement was adopted, had more than once stated in his place in the House of Commons that he did not intend that the half-pay of these officers should rise; and the Board of Admiralty in 1856 put a similar interpretation upon the Order in Council. Was the present Board of Admiralty to have reversed both these decisions? It appeared to him to be impossible that they should do so. More than this—of the eighty-five officers who were on this list, fifty-two were ineligible for promotion on the active list as captains, because they had not served the necessary time as commanders. These were ample reasons for not interfering with the existing state of things. But, in order that he might not seem to treat these officers with hardness, or with anything but the most perfect fairness, he had submitted the case to the Law Officers of the Crown, from whom he received a long and carefully drawn opinion stating, that there was no foundation for the claims which were now put forward. There was, then, against this claim the decision of the Board of Admiralty in 1856; the declaration of Sir

Francis Baring; the usage and practice of the service, according to which, if this demand was conceded, fifty-two officers who were ineligible for the rank of captain would go on rising through that rank, whereas if they had remained on the active list they would not have so risen; and, besides all these, the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown that there was no foundation for these claims. He did not think that he could be accused of having acted unfairly to these officers by adhering to all these opinions and decisions. It would, of course have been more agreeable to him to say, "This is only a small matter, let us give this boon;" but he could not overlook the circumstance that a few thousands spent upon one list and a few thousands upon another would grow into a large sum of money, and that it was constantly necessary, and would continue to be necessary, to incur additional expense in providing new means of retirement for old officers. He hoped that in future no such misunderstanding as this would arise. There ought to be only two lists, "the active" and "the retired." The Admiralty had, he believed, taken the best course that could be adopted. They had closed these lists, and therefore the number of officers upon them would gradually decrease, and the lists themselves would eventually disappear. In conclusion, the noble Duke said, that upon looking over the list of eighty-five officers he found that eighteen or twenty of them received under the Warrant of 1860 a higher rate of pay than they would have been entitled to if they had remained upon the active list.

The Earl of HARDWICKE said, he thought his noble and learned Friend fully justified in bringing the case forward, but admitted that the noble Duke had stated the real difficulty of the case. The only excuse that could be made was that under various Governments and different Boards of Admiralty, according to the feelings of the time, these lists had been created, and when looked upon with reference to the services of officers upon them, no doubt cases of great injustice were shown. The only means by which justice could be done was by breaking up the separate lists and amalgamating them. If that amalgamation did not take place the injustice so much complained of could not be remedied. On the list of 1851 there were officers who had probably seen more service than any who were not on the active list, and yet they were only receiving 10*s*. 6*d*. a day, while other officers were receiving 16*s*., 20*s*., and even 25*s*. a day. He thought the condition of the lists generally inflicted great injustice, not only upon the officers, but upon the country generally. The country required young and active men for its service, and if the service was carried on on the present system young and active men would never reach a high rank. The present system had resulted in a deadlock, owing to the old (and he said it without the least disrespect), useless gentlemen who blocked the way of the younger men to promotion. Those old gentlemen, who had long served their country with honour, were now unfit on account of their age to serve it any longer, and some steps should be taken to enable them to retire, and so enable the younger men to rise in the service. He did not blame the present Government for the deadlock which existed, as it had arisen naturally from the system into which the service had fallen, but he hoped that the noble Duke opposite would endeavour to provide for the more rapid advancement of the younger officers.

WARRANT OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

The Earl of HARDWICKE said, that the noble Duke at the head of the Admiralty had been kind enough to allow him to put a Question in reference to Warrant Officers of which he had given notice. The noble Duke had made a great many alterations in the service, and the consequence was that a great number of new ranks had been created, which had caused a constant anxiety for change of rank. They also caused greater difficulty in governing the navy and maintaining its discipline. Among other ranks the Government had created that of warrant officers in chief; and no sooner had the rank been created than dissatisfaction arose. There were 1,200 warrant officers in the service, and from these the Admiralty had selected fourteen carpenters, fourteen gunners, and twenty-seven boatswains, and created them warrant officers in chief. Now the gunners and carpenters did not understand this disparity and were dissatisfied that there were not twenty-seven from each class promoted, that number of men having been selected from the boatswains. They also thought that instead of the men intended for promotion being selected from the whole number, they ought to rise by seniority, the same as the officers rose upon the flag list. The question he wished to ask was, Whether the Admiralty intended to equalize the number of gunners and of carpenters to that of boatswains who had been raised to the chief rank—namely, twenty-seven of them; and also, whether it was intended that the harbour duty officers should participate in this promotion, and if not upon what principle they were passed over?

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, that in the first instance twelve gunners, twelve boatswains, and twelve carpenters had been promoted from the sea service list of warrant officers. Simultaneously with these promotions, but quite separate from them, promotion was given to certain warrant officers employed in the dockyards. Boatswains were employed in the dockyards as superintendents, and it was thought desirable that men in their position should have the rank of chief boatswain, but without the increase of pay which the same class of warrant officers on sea service were to receive with their promotions. It was not intended to confer this rank on warrant officers employed in harbour service.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 30, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions* [June 29]—East India (Revenue Accounts).
First Reading — Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [254].
Second Reading — Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [251]; Rochdale Vicarage * [*Lords*] [252].
Third Reading—Admiralty, &c., Acts Repeal * [*Lords*] [242]; Dockyard Ports Regulation * [*Lords*] [244]; Admiralty Powers, &c.* [*Lords*] [243].
Withdrawn—Postmaster General * [144].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 205 and 235 be suspended for the remainder of the Session.

Ordered, That, as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments, on or before Monday next, such Amendments be considered on the next sitting of the House after the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from The Lords.

Ordered, That, as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments, after Monday next, such Amendments be considered forthwith.

Ordered, That when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a Copy of such Amendments shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office, and Notice thereof given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from The Lords.—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

FARM BUILDINGS AND COTTAGES IN SCOTLAND.—QUESTION.

MR. KINNAIRD said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie), he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Inclosure Commissioners have been able to make any arrangement by which Plans and Specifications for Farm Buildings and Cottages in Scotland proposed to be erected under Land improvement Acts may be submitted to an Architect or Surveyor acquainted with the Scotch system of erecting Farm Buildings and Cottages; and whether the Inclosure Commissioners have yet agreed to modify their requirements for Farm Labourers' Cottages in Scotland so as to make them more suited to the wants and habits of the people of Scotland and the climate of the country?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that immediately after the discussion which took place a short time ago on the observations made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hastings (Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie) with reference to the rules and practice of the Inclosure Commissioners, he addressed a letter to the Commissioners, stating the nature of the objections to their alleged practices, and requesting them to furnish him with a full Report as to the rules upon which they acted, and the manner in which those rules were carried out. That Report had just been received, and it would be laid upon the table of the House immediately.

LAW OF SIMONY.—QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether, during the Recess, the Government will take the present state of the Law of Simony into consideration, with a view to its simplification and improvement?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied that the Commissioners having recommended that the present state of the law relating to simony should be considered, it was undoubtedly the duty of the Government to take the subject into consideration, though he confessed he apprehended the alteration of the law would be a matter of some difficulty.

ARMY—MACKAY'S GUN.—QUESTION.

MR. J. EWART said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, If he has received any Report of the Competitive Trial which took place on the 20th, 22nd, and 23rd instant, between Mackay's 12-pounder windage muzzle-loader Gun, and the Armstrong 12-pounder breech-loader service Gun; the Mackay Gun firing smooth cast-iron projectiles without expansion, and the Armstrong lead-coated projectiles without any windage; and whether he has any objection to lay such Report upon the table?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, he believed that Mr. Mackay's gun, which had been sent to Shoeburyness for trial, had already been to a certain extent tried by the Ordnance Select Committee, but no Report of those trials had yet been received at the War Office, as it was not usual to send in a Report until the trials were completed, which was not the case with Mr. Mackay's gun. He should state that no orders had been given for a competitive trial between the Mackay and any other gun. The gun sent to Woolwich was sent there for trial as to range, accuracy, and so on, but not for the purpose of comparing and testing it as to service with any other gun. To lay the Report of the trials upon the table before they were completed, and before the Secretary of State for War had decided upon the course to be adopted with regard to the gun, would be an unusual course. It was very improbable that the final Report would be received during the present Session, and therefore it was unnecessary for him to answer further the latter part of the hon. Gentleman's question.

MASTERS IN THE NAVY.

QUESTION.

MR. CORRY said, he rose to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, in reference to the statement made by the First Lord, that, before carrying into effect the proposed scheme for the abolition of the rank of Master in the Royal Navy, it would be presented to Parliament and time given for considering it, Whether the final decision of the Admiralty on the subject will now be deferred till the next Session?

MR. CHILDERS said, in reply, that it was not the intention of the Admiralty to take any steps with respect to the abolition of the rank of Master beyond what had been taken already. What had been done up to the present was simply to discontinue the entry of second-class Naval Cadets, and that discontinuance would be carried on; but, before any further step was taken, the new Parliament would have met, and time would be given to discuss the scheme when any Order in Council might have been issued.

ARMY—FIELD ALLOWANCE TO OFFICERS AT ALDERSHOT.—QUESTION.

MAJOR KNOX said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether any Field Allowances has been granted to the Officers and Men who have applied for them from Aldershot? The officers were put to great inconvenience, and the men wore out their clothes in consequence of the frequent marchings of flying columns.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, as he had received no notice of the question of the hon. and gallant Member, he could not give a positive answer. His impression, however, was that field allowances were never granted unless when troops were before an enemy. He would, however, make inquiry.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Moved, That the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday next.

MINOR CANONS, &c.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he rose to call attention to the inadequate stipends of the Minor Canons and Non-Capitular Members of the Cathedral of Carlisle and of other Cathedrals of the New Foundation. He said the case was shortly this. The cathedrals of the new foundation were re-founded and established at the time of the Reformation, and the inferior members of them were not members of distinct corporations, as in the old cathedrals, but stipendiaries dependant for what they received on the general revenues of the chapter. Taking a prebendary as the general standard, these non-capitular members had stipends in proportion, the minor canons having one-half. During the last century all the payments fell into abeyance, and when the Act of 1840 was under consideration it was found that the deans and chapters were in receipt of the greater part of the revenue. When the Act of 1840 was passed the cathedrals were supposed to be of little utility, and therefore the claims of the non-capitular members were but little considered. Since then, however, it had been discovered that the cathedrals were of the greatest utility, and they had been restored to the position which they formerly held. Although the deans received large salaries, the non-capitular members, upon whom all the active duties of the cathedrals virtually devolved, were still in receipt of very small salaries. Under these circumstances, the subject had been discussed before the Cathedral Commission instituted by Lord Derby, in 1860, by that House during the passing of the Ecclesiastical Commission Bill, and since then by the Ecclesiastical Commission Committee, which sat during the Sessions of 1862 and 1863, when the evidence was very fully gone into, and both the Commission and Committee came to the conclusion that the position of the non-capitular members was unsatisfactory, and that some measures ought to be adopted for their relief. The law with regard to the non-capitular members of the cathedrals of the new foundation was in a very anomalous state. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners had no power whatever to deal with them, and, therefore, if an application was made by those gentlemen to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for relief, they were told to apply to the dean and chapter, while, if application was made to the latter, they were told that all the revenues derived from their estates were paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and that they had no power to interfere. It would be seen, therefore, that the law was in a very imperfect state, for the law which gave the Ecclesiastical Commissioners power to receive the surplus revenues gave them no power to apply them. The cathedral of Carlisle was a singular instance of what he meant. In 1850 the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle made over their estates to the Ecclesiastical Commission, in consideration of a commutation payment. That commutation payment was fixed at £5,680. By the scheme approved by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and made law by an Order in Council, the sum of £4,200 out of the sum of £5,680, was allotted to the dean and chapter, and £900 given to the non-capitular members. The cathedral duties of the dean and chapter, although they received so large a proportion of the revenues, were light, while the duties of the non-capitular members, particularly of the minor canons were exceedingly heavy, constant daily attendance being exacted from them. The number of minor canons in the cathedral had been reduced from five to two, but it must be obvious that two were quite insufficient to perform the duty. The Dean of Carlisle had written an able pamphlet on cathedral reform, in which he stated that three minor canons in his cathedral would be scarcely sufficient to perform the service. The Dean of Carlisle received an income of £1,400 a year and a house, the canons £700 a year and a house, while the two minor canons only received £150 a year less income tax, and had no house provided for them. Under the old system the five minor canons received £60 a year, yet each was allowed to hold a chapter living. By the new Act, however, a minor canon, although he received £150 a year, was not allowed to hold a living, unless within six miles, while a canon could hold a living not in the gift of the dean and chapter at any distance. It had been stated, that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were about to make a new arrangement relative to the revenues of the dean and chapter, whereupon Mr. Livingstone, one of the minor canons, applied to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to know whether they would recommend an annual payment to the minor canons more adequate to their wants and claims. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners replied, that they were unable to entertain the subject, and referred the writer to the dean and chapter. On making an application in that quarter he received a reply from the chapter clerk, stating, that the letter had been laid before the dean and chapter, and that he had been instructed to give no reply. It was only fair that the Government should see whether some remedy could not be applied. Another class of cases deserving attention was that of members of the foundation, such as grammar boys and choristers, who were all entitled to receive adequate allowances. By the statutes of Westminster Abbey the chorister boys were entitled to the same allowances as the Queen's scholars or boys on the foundation. They were to be educated under the college masters. They were to have a preference in the vacant scholarships on the foundation, and every inducement was held out to these boys to engage upon the choral service of the Abbey. Their present position was, however, miserable. The privilege of being educated in Westminster School had been withdrawn from them. They were now educated by one of the sacristans, and although no doubt the education they received was good of its kind, yet it appeared from a Return that the schoolmaster only received £100 a year, and the House would easily imagine that the education which they received was by no means in accordance with that to which they were entitled under the statutes. They received no allowances for board or lodging, and it appeared that only £138 was divided among sixteen scholars, being an average of less than £9 a year. It also appeared by a Return that the receipts of the Church amounted to not less than £60,000 a year. The dean was paid £2,000; some of the canons received over £2,000; others £1,600, and none less than £1,000. The dean and chapter had been compelled to raise the allowance to the Queen's scholars to £60, whilst these poor boys, who were entitled under the statutes to be placed in the same position as the Queen's scholars, had this wretched pittance of £9 a year doled out to them. In other cathedrals the chorister boys were much better treated. In St. Paul's, for instance, the sum paid to them in 1861 was £498, and in 1862 it was £567, and besides this gratuities were given to the amount of £125 for the purpose of placing them out in life. Under these circumstances he hoped the Government would undertake, in the course of the next Session, to introduce a Bill for the amendment of the law, or give an assurance that, if a measure on the subject should be originated by a private Member, the Government would keep the promise given by the late Sir George Lewis, and give the measure the best consideration. He wished to ask Her Majesty's Government, whether they intend next Session to introduce a measure to give power to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England to deal with and increase Non-Capitular Stipends in such cases as they may think fit?

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, that as the representative of a cathedral town, he could bear out the statements which had been made by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. The three minor canons at Peterborough received only £500 a year amongst them. They had no chance of preferment, and were expected to be in attendance at all times, whilst the canons were not required to be in residence more than three months. Surely it was discreditable to the Church of England that its revenues should be appropriated in such a way.

Mr. WALPOLE said, the House ought to know that the minor canons were in almost all cases a distinct corporation, and possessed distinct corporate property. By a Bill of last year, power was given to deal with the property belonging to certain minor canons, enabling them to commute their estates to the Commissioners, whereby they might be better administered, and the moneys of the minor canons might thus be increased. He knew no other property out of which provision could be made for the minor canons, than property transferred from the sinecure rectories and suspended canonries to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and property belonging to the capitular bodies. In many cases, he was aware the minor canons were paid much less than their services merited. The difficulty was in knowing out of what fund you were to provide for their better payment. As an Ecclesiastical Commissioner he considered himself bound to take care that the additional payment should not come out of funds appropriated to give spiritual assistance where it was most required—that is to say, to make adequate provision for clergymen engaged in parochial duties. That was the trust imposed upon the fund administered by the Commissioners, and until it was discharged he should think it doubtful whether any portion of the property ought to be handed over to the minor canons. With regard to the property belonging to the different capitular bodies, it was not generally recollected that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had nothing to do with that property except by agreement with those bodies in cases where they might desire to commute fluctuating incomes for a fixed sum. At all events, if the capitular bodies were willing to charge their life interest in the capitular estates in order to provide a more adequate fund for the remuneration of the minor canons, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would raise no objection arising out of any interest which they might have in these estates. Some arrangement of this kind might be made for the benefit of the minor canons, but in the absence of any compulsory power to deal with the capitular bodies and their estates, he was afraid the Governments would find considerable difficulty in arranging the matter. If the Government, however, could see their way clear to the proposal of a measure next Session, providing a more adequate remuneration for minor canons in these cases, he should be glad to find that some satisfactory arrangement might be effected.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he was not acquainted with the facts of the case, nor accurately acquainted with the law, until the Motion of the hon. Gentleman was placed on the paper; but on communicating then with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, he found that in 1850 the number of minor canons connected with the Cathedral of Carlisle was fixed at two, and that their income was from £150 to £200 a year each. He was informed that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had no power to increase these incomes, but that it was in the power of the Dean and Chapter to do so. As his right hon. Friend (Mr. Walpole) had suggested, the difficulty was to know out of what fund the increase of these stipends was to come. In many cases the duties performed by the parochial clergy were more important than those performed by the minor canons, and the surplus funds in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were appropriated as they ought to be—namely, in providing spiritual instruction for the people at large. If, however, the object of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bentinck) was to enable the Dean and Chapter, out of the funds belonging to them, to make provision which now they have no power to make for the minor canons, he should be glad to consider a Bill on that subject. He quite agreed with his right hon. Friend that it would be objectional to divert any portion of the funds which were now applicable by law to the increase of small benefices, and apply it for the benefit of the minor canons. But if the capitular bodies were inclined to make such a provision out of the capitular estates, and were now prevented by the law from doing so, it would be only reasonable to remove any such obstacle.

ARMY—SALARY OF DR. SUTHERLAND.

QUESTION.

COLONEL HERBERT said, that the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) stated the other day, in answer to the hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote), that the remuneration of Dr. Sutherland was fixed at £3 3*s*. a day, and was afterwards "continued at the same rate so long as he was completely occupied upon these duties." The noble Marquess added, that Dr. Sutherland's time had since been entirely occupied on the details of the business of the Sanitary Commission, and he therefore continued to receive the above rate of remuneration; that his salary was charged in the Vote of £20,000 taken for sanitary services, and that this arrangement was generally approved by the Treasury. It appeared from the papers since published that on the 5th of June, 1858, a letter was written from the War Office to the Treasury, by direction of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Peel), with reference to certain Committees and sub-Committees appointed to assist in organizing the hospital and sanitary arrangements of the army; and in this letter occurred the following passage—

> "As there are expenses for travelling and attendance arising out of the same, and as the sub-Committees are offshoots and extensions of the Royal Commission, I am to request the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury will authorize the charges incidental thereon, being issued temporarily from army funds, and reclaimed, as in the case of Royal Commissions, from the Vote for Civil Contingencies."

It appeared that Dr. Sutherland was now altogether employed. He was therefore drawing £3 3*s*. a day for every day in the year, and had been doing this for several years past. There was, however, no appearance of this charge in the Army Estimates, and therefore the House had been voting about £1,100 a year to Dr. Sutherland for some years past without the slightest knowledge that it was voting anything to that gentleman. The sanction of the Treasury, given through Sir Charles Trevelyan to the arrangement proposed by the War Office, appeared to him a mere form, and of no value whatever, except as sanctioning a merely temporary arrangement. He wished, therefore, to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is aware that the sanction of the Treasury has been given to this payment of £3 3*s*., as a salary, to Dr. Sutherland, and whether he approves such a construction being placed upon the Treasury sanction of the "expenses" of the Sanitary Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that in the only document which had issued from the Treasury on the subject—namely, the letter of the 11th of June, 1858, signed by Sir Charles Trevelyan—the question raised was considered one quite of departmental routine and practice, and was not, therefore, referred to the political officers of the Government. In looking at the letter of Sir Benjamin Hawes, he was bound to state that he did not see any reference to a salary to Dr. Sutherland, or anybody else, but only to expenses for travelling and attendance; and he certainly should not have inferred that the payment of members of the Committees was included in its terms. That document was received before the present Government were in office. He had no official knowledge whatever on the subject, but he believed his noble Friend the Secretary of State for War was prepared to justify the proceeding.

GENERAL **PEEL** said, that the letter of Sir Benjamin Hawes was written in consequence of an account having been sent in certified by Lord Panmure as President of the Sanitary Commission, for the sum of £500, at the rate of three guineas a day to be paid to Dr. Sutherland. That was before he (General Peel) came into office, and all he did was to ask the Treasury how the money, the charge for which had been sanctioned by the President of the Sanitary Commission, was to be paid?

THE MARQUESS OF **HARTINGTON** said, he wished to remind the right hon. Gentleman (General Peel) that his sanction to the transaction embraced a little more than a reference to the Treasury as to how the money was to be paid, for, on a discussion respecting the accounts sent in, the question was brought to the right hon. Gentleman's notice, and the accounts included the charge of three guineas a day, as originally fixed by Lord Panmure. He was not sure what the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel Herbert) objected to in this matter. As to the appointment itself, he (the Marquess of Hartington) had no more to say than he had said the other day. Dr. Sutherland was in the Crimea, and on the Sanitary Commission, and had great experience. He was employed by the Home Office on questions of this nature before he was sent to the Crimea. Without disparagement of the Army Medical Department, he thought Dr. Sutherland's knowledge better fitted him for such a position than any gentleman connected with the Army Medical Department, however great his experience might otherwise be. As long as the work performed by the Army Sanitary Commission was to be done, it was impossible to place a more useful member on the Committee than Dr. Sutherland. The Committee was not to be permanent, and the appointment of Dr. Sutherland to attend the Committee and work out the details was not intended to be a permanent appointment at all. No doubt the labours of the Committee extended beyond what was originally intended by a reference to them of several questions relating to Indian sanitary matters. The work might not be brought to an end for a considerable time, but they should not give any ground to Dr. Sutherland for the assumption that his office was intended to be permanent or that he should have a claim for superannuation and additional allowances on the abolition of the office. Dr. Sutherland was perfectly aware of the position in which he stood, and that the office was not permanent. There was no more reason for an application being made to the Treasury since the date of the correspondence then there existed before. It was not referred to the Treasury for formal sanction, because it was not intended to be permanent. The hon. and gallant Gentleman would find, on reference to the debates on the Army Estimates, that some years ago the appointment of Dr. Sutherland was referred to in the House, and it was moved that the sum paid should not be allowed, which showed that there was no concealment of the appointment of Dr. Sutherland. The Audit Office asked for an explanation regarding the payment to Dr. Sutherland, and received it from the War Office, and as the Commissioners of Audit made no further objection, it was to be presumed that the explanation was satisfactory.

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR **HUGH CAIRNS**: I rise, Sir, to call attention to a matter of great interest to a considerable number of families, and which would be a subject of interest to the whole country if the circumstances were as generally known as it might be expected they would have been. I refer to the imprisonment of some of our fellow-subjects in the kingdom of Abyssinia. At the present moment the English Consul accredited by Her Majesty to Abyssinia, two English missionaries, and several British subjects are in confinement in that country, and most of them have been in confinement for a period of some eighteen or nineteen months. The first news of their imprisonment came to this country with the statement from Consul Cameron that he and other persons were at the time he wrote (February 14, 1864) in chains at Gondar. On the 27th of May, 1864, Mr. Flad, whom I do not understand to be a British subject, wrote, while in confinement, that Mr. Stern, one of the missionaries, was still bound, as were also Mr. Cameron and all his English servants. Mr. Rosenthal was free and living with his wife and children near Gondar. A little later, I find, by the intelligence which came to this country in November, and which probably left Abyssinia in the previous summer, the Emperor appeared to have taken some fresh offence. The statement was that his Majesty had gone the length of putting the prisoners, including Consul Cameron, to a kind of torture. I find next that a German missionary, writing in August, states—

> "No change for the better has taken place in the state of Abyssinian affairs. The captives, Messrs. Stern, Rosenthal, and the English Consul, have not only not been set at liberty, but have suffered from great violence."

And Mr. Rassam, our Assistant Resident at Aden, appears to have discovered—

> "that our unfortunate countrymen were confined in a tent next to that of the Emperor, all intercourse with them being forbidden under the severest penalties. Besides this vigilant watch, each European was chained to a trustworthy dependent of the Imperial household, who was relieved at short intervals. The chain being only four feet long, the prisoner could scarcely move without the knowledge of the guard."

The House will allow that this is a strange and startling state of circumstances to have occurred in reference to an English Consul and a number of English subjects. Well, where has this taken place, because, although we may have some general knowledge about Abyssinia, many Members may have lost the trace of its recent history? The present monarch of that country, who professes the Christian faith, and rules over a people who are also Christians, came to the throne by deposing his predecessor in 1855, and has reigned there ever since. He is a man of civilization, he has had intercourse with this country and with British subjects, and has always professed the greatest friendship for England, and the greatest admiration for everything English. Consul Plowden, the predecessor of Consul Cameron, was his Majesty's particular friend, and was loaded by him with every mark of favour that could be conceived. And not only that, but Mr. Bell, another Englishman, was very high in rank in the military forces of the Emperor Theodoros, a Prince addicted to warlike objects, and who professed to be greatly guided by Mr. Bell's advice. I find also that the predecessor of the Emperor Theodoros entered into a treaty with this country, which was laid on the table of this House in June, 1852, by which, among other things—and I ask particular attention to one of its articles—Her Britannic Majesty engages—

> "To receive and protect any Ambassador, Envoy, or Consul whom his Majesty of Abyssinia or his successors may see fit to appoint, and will equally preserve inviolate all the rights and privileges of such Ambassador, Envoy, or Consul."

By the preceding article the Emperor of Abyssinia reciprocally engages to receive and protect any Ambassador, Envoy, or Consul which England might send to that country. The Emperor of Abyssinia was dealt with in that treaty as a Sovereign worthy of every respect and consideration, and as a person with whom a treaty ought to be made and observed in its integrity. Well, what was the origin of the Emperor's change of feeling? If some of the statements which are made be correct—and they come from a quarter which leaves no room for doubting them—they show what serious consequences may spring from a very small cause. I observe, from the papers very lately laid on the table of the House, that the Emperor Theodoros addressed an autograph letter to Her Majesty, dated at the end of 1862, but received in this country on the 12th of February, 1863. We have that letter given us in the form of a translation, written in very intelligible style, but of course presenting all the peculiarities which you would expect to find in an autograph communication proceeding from an Oriental Sovereign. It begins thus—

> "In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one God in Trinity, chosen by God, King of Kings, Theodoros of Ethiopia to Her Majesty Victoria, Queen of England. I hope your Majesty is in good health. By the power of God I am well. . . . . Mr. Plowden, and my late Grand Chamberlain, the Englishman Bell, used to tell me that there is a great Christian Queen, who loves all Christians. When they said to me this, 'We are able to make you known to her, and to establish friendship between you,' then in those times I was very glad. I gave them my love, thinking that I had found your Majesty's goodwill. All men are subject to death, and my enemies, thinking to injure me, killed these my friends. But, by the power of God, I have exterminated those enemies, not leaving one alive, though they were of my own family, that I may get, by the power of God, your friendship. I was

prevented by the Turks occupying the sea-coast from sending you an embassy when I was in difficulty. Consul Cameron arrived with a letter and present of friendship. By the power of God I was very glad hearing of your welfare, and being assured of your amity. I have received your presents and thank you much. I fear that if I send Ambassadors with presents of amity by Consul Cameron they may be arrested by the Turks. And now I wish that you may arrange for the safe passage of my Ambassadors everywhere on the road. I wish to have an answer to this letter by Consul Cameron, and that he may conduct my Embassy to England. See how the Islam oppress the Christain!"

It appears that Captain Cameron, who, I believe, served on the staff of Sir William Williams when the latter was our Commissioner with the Turkish army, was appointed Consul to Abyssinia in 1861, and proceeded in 1862 to his post at Massowah, on the Red Sea. But Consul Cameron was intrusted with presents to take to the Emperor, and it was incumbent on him, in the first instance, to go inland to the capital to present them. He went accordingly, and offered these tokens of goodwill and friendship on the part of the Queen of England towards the Emperor of Abyssinia. In his autograph letter it would be seen that His Majesty proposed to send an envoy or ambassador to be received by the Sovereign of this country, as the treaty provided that any such Ministers should be received. He said he feared that if he sent ambassadors with presents of amity by Consul Cameron they might be arrested by the Turks, and he asked that arrangements might be made for the safe passage of his ambassadors everywhere on the road. This was a despatch coming to this country, as to which I do not presume to offer the least opinion whether the proposal ought to have been accepted or not, whether the embassy ought to have been encouraged or not, except that I find in the treaty a positive stipulation on our part to receive and give every protection to any ambassador or envoy whom the Sovereign of Abyssinia might see fit to appoint. Yet one thing was, I think, incumbent on Her Majesty's Government, and the omission of which, I fear, has led to serious consequences. King Theodoros, I should have thought, was entitled to an answer in some shape or form to the communication which he had sent. The despatch containing the Emperor's autograph letter was received in England on the 12th of February, 1863, and the papers that have been laid on the table state that no answer was returned until the 26th of May, 1864, or a period of more than fifteen months; and then the answer was not conveyed through any Britsh Consul in Egypt, but through Mr. Rassam, our assistant resident at Aden, himself a subject of Turkey — the very Power towards which, if the Emperor of Abyssinia was not actually at war with it, he at all events entertained feelings of considerable hostility. What was the result? The Emperor of Abyssinia had sent to France a similar communication to that which he had sent to this country, and from the French Government he had received an answer. Towards the end of 1863 he became greatly irritated at not obtaining any answer from the British Government. I do not at all pretend to justify the course which he took; certainly his acts were not warranted by the offence which he supposed had been offered him. But, smarting under a feeling of irritation, all the stronger because among Eastern nations such slights are more keenly felt than among Western races—wounded at what he thought the contemptuous reception of his communication and the rejection of his proposal to send an embassy to England — wounded also at what he might have taken to indicate a change of sentiment towards his country on the part of Great Britain, the Emperor arrested Consul Cameron, the two English missionaries to whom I have referred, and the other English subjects who were in his capital at this time, and put them in such confinement as I have described. That there may be no doubt that I am warranted in my inferences as to what led to the imprisonment of these persons, I will take the opinion of Sir William Coghlan, one of the most competent authorities on this matter, who was consulted in regard to it bv the Foreign Office, and who drew up a memorandum for the guidance of that Department. The subject of that memorandum was the Abyssinian difficulty, and how to get out of it; and it is most interesting. If some advice had been obtained from the same quarter before the Foreign Office got into this difficulty it might not, perhaps, have been much amiss. But, however, Sir William Coghlan sets out by advising the Foreign Office how best to get out of it. He says—

"There are probably several causes for the altered demeanour of the King of Abyssinia towards Captain Cameron, the British Consul. It is understood that his dignity is grievously wounded by the silence, which he accepts as an affront; and this sense of injury, coupled with other circumstances, has led to the deplorable state of affairs now existing at Gondar. Also, there is reason to believe that the King refuses Mr. Rassam's mission as one which is not of sufficient dignity; that Mr. Rassam is, in fact, a mere messenger, and not an Envoy; hence the contemptuous silence with which his letters and requests have been treated."

I stated to the House that in May, 1864, an answer was sent to the communication which had been received from the Emperor, but it was sent by Mr. Rassam, who was a resident at Aden and an Ottoman, which nation was particularly distasteful to the Emperor in every shape and form. The statement of Sir William Coghlan is that Mr. Rassam was not of sufficient dignity, being, in fact, a mere subordinate, resident at Aden. Sir William Coghlan goes on to say—

> "Inquiry into the 'other circumstances' alluded to in paragragh 9 would inconveniently lengthen this memorandum, which is intended only as a brief statement of the existing difficulty, and a suggestion as to the best means of overcoming it. If any further effort is to be made to release the captives, it must be by means of an Embassy, headed by an officer of rank, who should be supported by such a suite as would give dignity to his mission; a secretary (a military officer), two or three officers of the scientific corps or departments, and a medical officer, should be of the party; these could be supplied either from England, or from Bombay, or from Aden."

Well, then, to corroborate what Sir William Coghlan says as to the cause of offence being perfectly notorious, I have here an extract of a letter from Egypt, dated the 3rd of June in the present year. It is to this effect—

> "Theodoros is reported to have expressed himself very indignantly that the Queen's Government should have sent an Asiatic—a mere subordinate — on a mission to him, and, it is said, he does not intend to take the least notice of him."

He has not taken the least notice of him. The Emperor has refused to receive him, and has even treated it as an aggravation of the first offence he supposed he had received. I do not desire, far from it, to say one word in justification of the course taken by the King of Abyssinia towards these unfortunate prisoners. It was a violation of all that was proper as regards any of them, and especially as regards the British Consul. But it is only proper that we should know all the circumstances and facts of the case. It was suggested in another place, where some notice was taken of this question, that Consul Cameron had exceeded his duty in staying so long as he did at the capital of Abyssinia, instead of remaining at Massowah, the port on the sea-coast; but he could not present the gifts he bore to the Emperor without going to the capital. It is besides impossible to know whether he remained too long in the capital, because the papers carefully withhold all letters written by Consul Cameron to the Foreign Office explaining what his reasons were, and we have nothing but replies from the Foreign Office to Mr. Cameron censuring him for not returning to Massowah. I do not propose to enter on that question, nor does it really at all bear on the object I have in view in bringing the subject before the House. Suppose Consul Cameron committed an error in judgment, still the question now is, what is to be done with reference to these unfortunate persons? They have been confined for upwards of eighteen months. They have suffered great hardships, and the only step which the Government have taken, so far as I am aware, is that they have sent Mr. Rassam, who was not received by the Emperor, and treated as a mere messenger unworthy of notice. I would submit to the Government that this is a case in which, admitting to the fullest extent that the acts of the King of Abyssinia were a flagrant outrage on International Law, we can confess that there has been a certain amount of neglect, a certain degree of indecorous treatment of a Sovereign with whom we have a treaty of alliance, in refusing to answer a despatch sent by him to the Sovereign of this country for a period of a year and a half. It seems very easy to make an admission of that kind, and not to solicit but accompany it with a demand for the release of those persons who have been kept in confinement. In a case of this kind where the liberties, if not the lives, of our fellow-subjects are concerned, I cannot help thinking the time has come when the advice of Sir William Coghlan should be taken in some shape or other, and that a mission of some sort or nature acceptable to the King of Abyssinia should be sent him. I think it would be an act which the Sovereign of this country should be advised to do, seeing there had been an undesigned but unfortunate neglect of the communication sent by him for so great a length of time, and I should hope that overtures of that kind would not be unavailing. At all events it does seem to me that before Parliament separates some active and energetic steps should be taken to set these unfortunate persons at liberty, and I do hope that some announcement may be made which will relieve the anxiety which is felt by so many throughout the country on this subject.

MR. LAYARD: Sir, I can assure the hon. and learned Gentleman and the House that if Her Majesty's Government have refrained from entering fully into this painful subject, it is from no desire to screen their own conduct, or avoid full inquiry into the whole facts of the case. The reason why my noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the other House of Parliament, and myself in this House, have declined to enter into the subject was simply this:—In the first place, we feared lest anything should be said which might be conveyed—and it certainly would have been conveyed—to the Emperor of Abyssinia, which might lead either to the death of those unfortunate persons who are now held in captivity by him, or to their being treated with even greater severity than that with which they have hitherto been visited; and, secondly, I felt it would scarcely be fair to Consul Cameron, before receiving a full explanation from him, that statements should be made reflecting on his official character. But, after the statements we have heard to-night, and after the gross misstatements which have been made in a certain portion of the press, I think it my duty, if the House will kindly permit me, to enter at some length into the subject. I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to avoid anything that would lead to unfortunate results; but if anything does happen from what I shall state to-night, the responsibility must entirely rest upon those who have forced the Government to make these explanations. Before going further, I would make one remark on what I before stated with reference to the *Pall Mall Gazette* having published a statement derived from official sources. My statement has given pain to the members of the Foreign and Indian Offices. I have now to state that the information in question was not furnished by either of those offices, but it was furnished from Government confidential sources, and I trust I shall be enabled to ascertain who it is that has been guilty of a breach of confidence which may lead to serious consequences. I do not wish to go into a history of Abyssinia. If any hon. Member wishes to read an authentic account of what has taken place of late years in that country, I would refer him to two articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, written by M. Lejean, a gentleman who was French Consul there at the same time as Mr. Cameron was in Abyssinia. The Emperor of Abyssinia was formerly somewhat in the same position as the Mikado or Emperor of Japan — a mere puppet; the country itself being divided into several almost independent kingdoms, each governed by a great feudal lord, owning a mere nominal dependence on the Emperor. The principal of these chiefs, Ras Ali, reigned for several years over a large part of Abyssinia, waged many successful wars, and attained to considerable power. Two Englishmen, Messrs. Plowden and Bell, had assisted him materially with their advice in the conduct of his wars. Mr. Plowden came to this country some years ago. He described Abyssinia as very rich in natural resources, and represented that it would be very important that friendly relations should be established between that country and England. In consequence of his representations the Government appointed him Consul at Massowah—not an Abyssinian town, but a Turkish port on the Red Sea. Abyssinia is separated from the Red Sea by a broad tract of arid plain, forming a kind of petty kingdom under a chief who owns himself a vassal of Turkey, and there is no entrance to Abyssinia except through Turkish territory. Mr. Plowden, while Consul, was allowed to embark in trade, and the object of his being sent to Massowah was to extend British trade. But he did not remain there, but returned to Ras Ali, and, in company with Mr. Bell, appears to have continued to give him advice and assistance. In 1855 the present King Theodore, who had married the daughter of Ras Ali, rose against his father-in-law, defeated him, waged a series of wars against other feudal chiefs of Abyssinia, was very successful, and in a short time completely conquered the country. The treaty to which the hon. Gentleman alluded, was concluded, not with the present King of Abyssinia, but with Ras Ali. It was repudiated by the present King. This, as it will be shown, is very important. The present King never accepted it. This son-in-law of Ras Ali, Kassai, as he was called, was not of royal birth, but was a successful adventurer, and one of those enthusiasts who have often risen in the East. He took the name of Theodore because there was some prophecy current in Abyssinia that an Emperor of that name would defeat the Turks, recover Jerusalem, and found a great Ethiopic Empire in the East. A very curious description of this Theodore is given by M. Lejean and others who have written on Abyssinia. He is described as waging continual wars, and killing not only his tens, but his twenties of thousands in cold blood. In fact, the accounts given of his deeds reads very like those Assyrian records which have been translated of late years. He carried off men, women, and children into captivity, and committed many horrible acts, which, it is to be feared, have been of common occurrence amongst those who have ruled in Abyssinia. Unfortunately, Mr. Plowden, our Consul at Massowah, instead of attending to the object for which he was placed there, that of encouraging commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Abyssinia, plunged into local intrigues. He and Mr. Bell sided with King Theodore, and Mr. Plowden is stated to have actually commanded some of his troops. When information reached home that Mr. Plowden was thus mixing himself up in local conflicts, and acting exactly in opposition to the spirit of the policy which he had been placed there to carry out, Her Majesty's Government at once sent out instructions for him to return to his post at Massowah, and no longer to interfere in Abyssinian affairs. Unfortunately, before these instructions could reach him, Consul Plowden had been killed by a native Abyssinian chief. Before Mr. Plowden's death it had become known to us that the King of Abyssinia desired to send a mission to Europe, and this mission was heralded by letters written, not only to Her Majesty, but to the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of the French, and some of the German potentates, calling on them to help him in a great war against the Mahomedans, and to place him as ruler over the whole of Abyssinia and Ethiopia, and over all the dominions belonging to the Turks. Her Majesty's Government had, of course, no desire to engage in any undertaking of the kind, and accordingly wrote to Consul Plowden that they would receive no mission from King Theodore except he gave

> "a distinct assurance that he renounced all idea of conquest in Egypt and at Massowah; for that Her Majesty's Government had latterly remonstrated in the strongest terms against the intentions of the Viceroy of Egypt to attack Abyssinia, and that the then reigning Viceroy had not only put a stop to such proceedings, and had confined himself within the limits of his own dominions, but that he had set free the Abyssinian prisoners reduced to slavery by his predecessor, so that Her Majesty's Government would subject themselves to grave suspicions if they received an embassy from a Sovereign whose designs against the Sultan, Her Majesty's ally, were previously known to them."

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he wished to ask whether the despatch from which the hon. Gentleman was reading had been laid before the House?

Mr. LAYARD: It has not been laid before the House, but if the hon. Member so desires it shall be furnished. Such was the nature of the instructions sent to Mr. Plowden. The fact upon which the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) relies—namely, the existence of a treaty, which entitled King Theodore to send a mission to this country and bound us to receive it, is entirely at variance with the facts; for when Theodore came to the throne, the first thing he did was, as I have stated, to refuse to acknowledge the treaty entered into with his predecessor. As Ras Ali was not the Emperor of Abyssinia, but held a position somewhat similar to the old French *maire du palais*, in order to avoid all doubt as to the validity of the treaty, the signature of the puppet Emperor was also affixed to it. I believe that even at this moment Theodore admits he is not the real Emperor, and that the descendant of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba is living, to whom he owes a nominal allegiance; though, at the same time, he calls himself "King of Kings." Consul Plowden having been wounded and taken prisoner, was ransomed, but shortly after his release died from his wounds. This ransom of £200 was at first believed to have been paid by the King of Abyssinia; but I have received a letter from Mr. Plowden's brother, in which he states that, so far from the ransom having been paid by Theodore, it was paid by Consul Plowden's family, through M. Baroni, the English Vice Consul at Massowah. At that time, at any rate, the Government had reason to believe that Mr. Plowden had been ransomed by the King. Upon the death of Consul Plowden, Theodore wrote a letter, addressed to Lord Russell, and not to Her Majesty, as it has been asserted, stating that he had taken signal vengeance for the death of Mr. Plowden, whom he described as his personal friend. I may mention that that letter was never received in England, although we received information of its contents—it appears to have been lost by the way. Lord Russell, in reply, thanked King Theodore for what he had done with regard to Mr. Plowden, and sent him, in the name of the Government, some presents. Sir William Coghlan, the Political Resident or Governor of Aden, being then at Bombay, advised the Indian Government to lay out £500 in some further presents to the King, which was accordingly done, and some handsome carpets and other ornaments were sent to Theodore. But what were the services to the British Government, for which Theodore took credit? He stated himself to Captain Cameron that he had massacred in cold blood 1,500 persons in revenge for the loss of Mr. Plowden, and as a special mark of friendship towards Her Majesty. The French Consul estimates the number at 1,700, and even Dr. Beke, in his pamphlet, which is no doubt in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns), writes on the authority of Mr. Stern—

> "On the 31st of October, 1860, 3,000 rebels, with their leader, Gerat, were defeated by the Royal Troops near the western bank of the Taccazy, and mercilessly butchered in cold blood; in fact, so inexorable was the King, that even their wives and children — contrary to former custom—were indiscriminately condemned to perpetual slavery. The other statement is that of M Lejean, who, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for the 1st of November, 1864 (p. 234), states, that the prisoners, 1,700 in number, were taken by the Emperor to his camp at Dobarik, and there cut to pieces, and their bodies left unburied on the plain of that name, which three years afterwards was still covered with their bleached skulls."

All this was in revenge for the death of Consul Plowden, who had no business at the place where he was killed, who had been warned against taking any part in the affairs of the country, and met his death mainly through neglecting his instructions. It is not a pleasant thing to reflect that 1,500 innocent persons, more or less, have been put to the sword to revenge the death of one British subject; it is not a thing one can think of without horror. When it became necessary to send out some person with Lord Russell's letter and with the presents, to which I have alluded, Captain Cameron, who had been appointed Consul at Massowah, was chosen to take them to the King. Captain Cameron had served with distinction at Kars, and had held a consular post in the Russian territories in the Caucasus. Before proceeding to his post he came to London, was shown all the correspondence with his predecessor, was made acquainted with everything that had occurred in the case of Mr. Plowden, and received instructions himself, which will be laid before the House. He was directed most positively to refrain from interfering in any way whatever in the internal affairs of the country; to refrain from mixing himself up with intrigues, or attaching himself to any party in the country; he was merely to go to the King to deliver the letter and the presents, and then to return to Massowah, and there promote by every means in his power the trade of England with Abyssinia. I must now refer to some circumstances which have an important bearing upon this question. There were in Abyssinia at this time three missionary establishments, and I am sorry to say that, as usual, they were intensely jealous of one another. These establishments consisted of a German mission from Bâsle, a Protestant mission from this country, and a French Roman Catholic Propagandist mission. The Bâsle missionaries hated the English with an intensity of which some conception may be formed from the pages of the *Standard*, in which some letters on this subject have recently appeared. The Roman Catholics hated all the others. The King had no love for any of them. He soon put an end to one of the missions, and said, "I will have nothing to do with preaching the Gospel; but if you can be of any use to me, I shall be very glad that you should stay." In consequence of that decision the members of the Bâsle mission were compelled by the King to turn their attention to the manufacture of muskets; but as they produced very bad weapons he made them devote themselves, and with better success, to manufacturing brandy. Mr. Stern was allowed to preach to Jews and Mahomedans, but was strictly prohibited from converting any native Abyssinians. The Roman Catholic mission, with a bishop at its head, was expelled the country. Mr. Stern, who had been sent as a missionary from this country had returned to England, and having, while here, written an account of his adventures in Abyssinia, in which he did not speak in very complimentary terms of King Theodore, he had had the great imprudence to go back to Abyssinia. Such was the state of things when Consul Cameron reached Gondar. He found that the King had established his rule over the whole of Abyssinia, though there were still some rebels here and there, and that the missionaries were quarrelling among themselves and with the King. He presented Earl Russell's letter, together with the presents, to the King, and at first was well received, but shortly afterwards got a strong hint to leave the country. His provisions, which had at first been sent to him daily from the palace, were gradually diminished, until he was nearly starved. He was surrounded by spies, and every effort was made to induce him to leave Gondar, which, according to his instructions, he ought to have done immediately after delivering Earl Russell's letter and the presents. Instead of doing this, however, Consul Cameron began to open negotiations with the King, which might certainly have had the effect of leading him to believe it not impossible that he might receive support from England in his struggle with the Turks; and to our great astonishment, we one day received at the Foreign Office a despatch from Captain Cameron informing us that he was entering into formal and official negotiations with the King. [Sir HUGH CAIRNS: Is that despatch on the Table?] The reason why the despatches of Consul Cameron have not hitherto been produced is that they contain passages which might tend greatly to jeopardize him. Consul Cameron wrote to say—

> "I wrote immediately (to the King) stating that I was deputed to present him with certain gifts and a letter of introduction; also to discuss with him regarding the future; that when Mr. Plowden was killed there were two points under discussion—namely, one, a treaty; two, the sending an embassy to England. I offered to take these up where Mr. Plowden had left them."

Now, that was altogether contrary to the instructions he had received. So far was Consul Cameron from being instructed to propose an embassy to England from the King, that he was distinctly told that Her Majesty's Government would not entertain the idea of a mission unless he gave up all idea of conquering the Turks and invading Turkish territory. So that Consul Cameron was not justified in making such a proposal to the King. It appears that the King, thinking that Consul Cameron might induce Her Majesty's Government to assist him in exterminating the Mahomedans, wrote the letter to Her Majesty which has been quoted by the hon. Gentleman. It is one of those things you do not like to state in a person's absence, but I have reasons to think that this letter was suggested by Consul Cameron, who wished to come to this country with the embassy. I am quite under that impression; Sir William Coghlan is also of this opinion, I believe, and the letter bears that construction. The King, after writing this letter, ordered Consul Cameron to leave Gondar at once, and to go to Massowah. He had declared from the first that he would not receive a Consul; that one of the reasons for his refusal to ratify the treaty was, that it provided for the residence of a Consul at Gondar, and that he knew that with European nations the appointment of a Consul was only the first step to conquering a country. In spite of this warning Consul Cameron remained—most imprudently remained—in the country. Shortly afterwards we received a despatch from him stating that he had gone eastward, and that he was shut up in a kind of sanctuary, where he was surrounded by rebels, and that he had lost all his papers. A few days afterwards we received another despatch, stating that he had got out of the sanctuary and gone to the Egyptian frontier, and had extended the protection of the British flag to the tribes on that boundary. All this was so contrary to his instructions and so alarming that we wrote out without delay to desire him to refrain from all interference in Abyssinian affairs, to confine himself to his duty of promoting commercial relations with this country, and to return at once to his post at Massowah. A great deal has been said as to no answer having been sent to the letter from the King. I will ask any impartial person—whether having Consul Cameron's despatches such as I have described them before us — knowing that that letter originated after a distinct understanding with the King that Her Majesty's Government would not receive a mission until he had given up all idea of conquest upon Turkey—after the King had rejected the treaty which authorized him to send a mission to Europe — whether, under such circumstances, we were under any obligation to answer that letter at all? I can only say that even now, after what has passed, if the letter were put into my hands I should say it did not require an answer. The first letter of the King had been answered, and we did not wish that Consul Cameron should come home with a mission from the King. Having no wish to answer that letter, we sent it to the India Office to know whether they wished to answer it, because, it must be remembered, our relations with Abyssinia have been at all times more an Indian than an Imperial question. The India Office had, it appears, no wish to do so. They did not think it necessary that a mission should be sent to this country, the object of which was to get us to go to war with Turkey. What happened when an answer was sent to a similar letter from the King? As I have mentioned, the King wrote, not only to Her Majesty, but to the Emperor of Russia and the Emperor of the French. The latter sent a civil answer, through his Minister M. Drouyn de Lhuys, by a Consul, M. Lejean, stating that he was very glad to receive the King's letter, but all that the French Government begged of the King was that he would be more tolerant in his dominions, and not oppress the Roman Catholics. When M. Lejean presented that letter, the King of Abyssinia said it was signed by M. Drouyn de Lhuys, of whom he had no knowledge, and not by the Emperor. He then quarrelled with the French Consul, threw him into prison, and loaded him with chains. He released him after five or six weeks, and then ignominiously expelled him from the country. The day he was expelled from Gondar, Consul Cameron appears to have asked him how he liked the feel of Abyssinian chains. M. Lejean replied, "You may be able to judge yourself in a day or two's time." Consul Cameron, according to M. Lejean, answered "Very likely." One would have thought that after these repeated warnings he would have gone away with Consul Lejean, instead of which he remained in Gondar, almost inviting a similar fate. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) has mixed up several facts and dates. He wishes the House to believe that Consul Cameron and the missionaries were imprisoned because no answer was sent to the King's letter. Nothing of the kind. The two events had nothing to do with each other. The missionaries were imprisoned when Mr. Stern returned to Abyssinia, and sometime before Consul Cameron. It is not quite clear what took place between the King and Mr. Stern, but the latter was directed to leave the country. He did not go, and at a subsequent interview the King said Mr. Stern was not to blame because he did not know the customs of the country which made it necessary that the King's orders should be immediately obeyed, but that his servants were to blame because they did. He then ordered them to be so severely bastinadoed that they both died during the night. While they were undergoing their punishment, Mr. Stern, horrified at the sight, bit his thumb. The King perceived this gesture, which in Abyssinia is supposed to infer an insult and a threat. He had Mr. Stern beaten, and his books and papers were seized. The book which he had written and these papers were translated for the King by some Europeans, who appear to have borne no goodwill to Mr. Stern. Amongst other things, Mr. Stern had stated that the Queen's mother had at one time of her life sold in the streets a bitter medicine much used in Abyssinia. The King was exceedingly angry, and Mr. Rosenthal's papers having also been seized, both were thrown into prison. He next called a Court of all the Europeans at Gondar to judge Messrs. Stern and Rosenthal. The Court condemned them both to death, but recommended them to mercy; the reason given by the Europeans being that if they had not condemned the prisoners to death they (the prisoners) would certainly have incurred that fate, whereas by condemning them and recommending them to mercy they hoped that the prisoners would escape death. It appears that they were right. Messrs. Stern and Rosenthal were condemned to perpetual imprisonment on the finding of the European Court. But to return to Consul Cameron. Not only had he got into trouble with the Abyssinians, but he had actually got into trouble with the Turks also, for he wrote to us to say that so angry were the Turks at his interference at Bogos that he should not be surprised if they had another "massacre of Jeddah," that massacre having taken place shortly before. It appears that Consul Cameron went soon afterwards to Tigré, and he wrote on the 31st of March to say that the King had stated that if anything happened to him he would reduce Tigré to a desert, and he added that the King would have kept his word. Thus perhaps tens of thousands of innocent persons might have been slaughtered because of the indiscretion of one Englishman. Could the Government do otherwise than tell Consul Cameron to go back immediately to his post at Massowah, and can blame be attached to them if their despatches to that effect were intercepted by the King, and made an additional cause of grievance, as it is asserted, against the British Government? I now come to the imprisonment of Consul Cameron. Dr. Beke, who cannot be suspected of being anxious to exonerate Her Majesty's Government, has published a letter in which he says that the Emperor Theodore's ill treatment of Consul Cameron was caused by the altered policy of the Government with regard to the relations between Abyssinia and Egypt, and that he (the Emperor) hoped to induce Her Majesty's Government, by holding our Consul and British subjects in captivity, to retrace its steps, and continue to afford him material aid against his enemies. M Lejean, moreover, positively declares that the imprisonment of Consul Cameron had nothing to do with the non-receipt of an answer by the King to his letter to the Queen. When we first received the news of the Consul's imprisonment, we consulted Sir William Coghlan, a gentleman of great experience of the East, and long British Resident or Governor at Aden, but who is now living in England. He knows a great deal of Abyssinian affairs, and he agreed with us in thinking that the first thing to be done was to endeavour to obtain the liberation of Captain Cameron, by sending a letter from the Queen to King Theodore, and to intrust that letter to Mr. Rassam. Mr. Rassam's character and position have been much misunderstood. Mr. Rassam's brother has for a long time been British Vice Consul at Mossul. Although a Chaldean Christian, and a native of Mossul, he was brought up in this country, was educated at Oxford, and in every respect—manners, dress, and appearance—is like an English gentleman. He was with me during the whole of my explorations in Assyria, and without Mr. Rassam's assistance this country would not, perhaps, now be in possession of that valuable collection of Assyrian antiquities which are deposited in the British Museum. Mr. Rassam was at first sent to Aden in a very subordinate position, but, by his ability and attention to his duties, he raised himself to be Assistant Resident or Lieutenant Governor of Aden, was made an English magistrate, and the country round about Aden, which before was almost inaccessible to Europeans, was reduced by him to perfect peace. What does Sir William Coghlan say of Mr. Rassam? He says—

> "Mr. Rassam's antecedents, his status, and his qualifications are greatly misunderstood and misrepresented by a portion of the press of this country. He has been variously styled Levantine, Greek, obscure Armenian, Turkish subject, nondescript, &c. In answer to these assertions it is but just to a very deserving public servant to say what Mr. Rassam really is. He was born at Mossul, of Christian parents (his brother is British Vice Consul there), he received his education in England, he is a gentleman in manners and conduct, and his qualifications for the peculiar line in which he has been employed during the last ten years cannot be surpassed. I speak with confidence on this point, for Mr. Rassam was my assistant at Aden during many years of trouble; a part of that time he held charge of our political relations at Muscat, and acquitted himself to the entire approval of the Government which placed him there. In short, Mr. Rassam's whole previous career well justified the expectation which Her Majesty's Government entertained in appointing him to the delicate and difficult mission on which he is now employed. The disappointment of that expectation is not attributable to any fault of his."

That is the opinion of Sir William Coghlan in a letter addressed to me, which he has authorized me to read to the House. A letter has been written to *The Times*, by a great authority on such matters, Sir Gardner Wilkinson, stating that we ought to have consulted the Coptic Patriarch. We have not omitted to do this, but it must be remembered that there are great differences between the Abyssinian Patriarch and the Coptic Patriarch, and there is great doubt whether the assistance of the latter would have been of any avail, or whether any interference on his part might not have had a prejudicial effect. But we did get letters from him for Mr. Rassam for the chief Bishop of Abyssinia. It is all very well to say that we ought to have sent a great mission, with Sir William Coghlan at its head. But suppose we had sent a great mission, and it had shared the fate of Consul Cameron and the missionaries, what could we have done? On arriving at Massowah Mr. Rassam wrote to King Theodore to tell him that he was the bearer of a letter from the Queen, and that if he sent him a proper escort he would go up to him. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) has stated, on the authority of Sir William Coghlan, that Mr. Rassam being an Eastern was not a proper person to be sent to King Theodore. But such is certainly not the case. The King had no reason to know that Mr. Rassam was anything but an English gentleman, which he is in every respect, and a proper person, from his rank and station at Aden, to be sent on this mission. It was said that the Emperor was displeased at the smallness of Mr. Rassam's mission. But the mission did not consist of Mr. Rassam alone; he was accompanied by a medical man and other gentlemen, and had with him a small vessel of war. So far from the Emperor having been displeased by the smallness of the mission, I have reason to believe that he was frightened by the vessel of war. The only explanation that I can give of the delay which has taken place in Mr. Rassam's departure for the interior, and the refusal of the King to answer the letters which have been written to him, and to give Mr. Rassam permission to visit his court and a safe conduct, is this—During the last two years the King has been waging war against his subjects, there has been an almost general rebellion in the country, his capital is at the present moment in the hands of the rebels, his power is greatly reduced, and his communications with the coast are cut off. Mr. Rassam's messengers had the greatest difficulty in getting through, and Mr. Rassam is of opinion that the King would not invite him to go up, because he would then see the state of the country, and might perhaps fall into the hands of the insurgents. It was not until Sir William Coghlan found that Mr. Rassam could not go up to Gondar, that he advised that a great mission should be sent, and he offered to go himself. Now, we have consulted Sir William Coghlan during the whole of these proceedings, but we could not agree with him on that point. After all the responsibility lies with us, and not with him. Suppose Sir William and his suite had been thrown into prison and ill-treated by the King, what would have been our position? We know that Consul Cameron and the missionaries have only themselves to blame; but if we sent up Sir William Coghlan with a large mission, and they had been imprisoned, the blame would have been entirely ours. I can assure the House that I have it on the highest authority—an authority which for various reasons I can not now name—that if we had sent up such a mission its members would have been thrown into prison; and the reason has been rightly given by Dr. Beke—namely, that the King thinks he can coerce us by holding our agents as captives into giving him assistance against the Turks. If he had thrown Sir William Coghlan and his suite into prison, would you have gone to war with the King? Remember that there is no sea-board, and that you would have to send an army across most unhealthy and inhospitable plains, to scale lofty mountains before they could reach Abyssinia—to do what? To avenge the imprisonment of a mission we had ourselves sent in spite of the warning we had received, and thereby sacrificing a large number of valuable British lives. If we had done so you would have justly condemned Her Majesty's Government. It appears, therefore, to me that the most prudent course was to decline to accept Sir William Coghlan's proposal. Sir William Coghlan is not responsible for the results, but we are. We had a great many other proposals; among others, that of Dr. Beke, who proposed to go to the King to preach to him on the advantages of free trade and to tell him what valuable coal and iron mines he possessed. But assuredly that is not the kind of lesson to teach King Theodore. Propositions of this kind are all very well coming from irresponsible persons, but her Majesty's Government are responsible, and if Sir William Coghlan or Dr. Beke had been thrown into prison would be held responsible for having exposed them to it. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Hugh Cairns) has spoken of such an event as the imprisonment of a British subject as if it were a thing quite unheard of. But we had a similar case not so long ago. The House will remember the case of Colonel Stoddart and Captain Connolly, who, sent on a political mission, were imprisoned and put to death by the King of Bokhara. Did we send an army to the centre of Asia to avenge their death, or even a special mission to the tyrant who had caused it? In this case Consul Cameron exceeded his instructions; he might have left the country, but he mixed himself up with its affairs. At this moment it is impossible to say why he is imprisoned; but any one who reads the papers that have been laid upon the table will see that no one is to blame for what has happened but himself. All I can say, in conclusion, is, that everything which can in prudence be done for his release and that of the missionaries will be done. We had received intelligence up to the end of May from them, and, though still in captivity, they are in good health, and, as far as Captain Cameron is concerned, he is in good spirits. I trust that in a short time we shall hear good tidings. I have now made my statement respecting the case, and after this statement I hope it will appear to the House that the Government are not to blame, but that up to this time they have done all that they could do. The only reason for not making this full statement before was lest it might prove prejudicial to those for whom we all feel so deeply concerned.

SIR HUGH CAIRNS: Will the hon. Gentleman lay upon the table the documents from which he has quoted?

MR. LAYARD: Yes.

MR. LIDDELL: Sir, the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary, in the opening of his remarks, threw on my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Hugh Cairns) the responsibility of any consequences that might arise from this discussion. I trust those consequences will not be serious, but I should like to point out that if responsibility rests on this side of the House for inquiring into the fate of imprisoned British subjects, a much greater responsibility attaches to the words and expressions of the Government on this occasion. Regarding this as a delicate matter, in which we are engaged in delicate negotiations with an irascible Sovereign, who has irresistible power over the captives, I think it would have been more prudent if the hon. Gentleman had not indulged in such terms as "puppet King" and similar expressions of that kind.

MR. LAYARD: The expression was not applied to the Emperor Theodore, but to the supposed Emperor of Abyssinia.

MR. LIDDELL: I think the hon. Gentleman should have been more discriminating in his expressions considering the consequences that might ensue to the persons imprisoned. But, Sir, I have heard with the greatest satisfaction the altered tone of my hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Layard), from which I think we may derive an instructive lesson. The House is in the habit of hearing many discussions on Oriental matters, but the Foreign Office is now, it appears, impressed with the expediency of a non-interfering, a non-meddling, policy with respect to these semi-civilized Sovereigns. I cannot help thinking that the Sovereign of Abyssinia must have heard of our policy in China and Japan, and that those feelings of jealousy have been excited by the past history of our conduct with regard to China. The Sovereign has had the greatest objection to an English envoy obtaining entrance to his capital. I cannot help thinking that the beginning of these transactions was coincident with an attempt—happily frustrated—for the establishment of an English naval officer in a high position in China for the purpose of intermeddling in the affairs of that country and wresting power from the hands of the proper authorities. I hope and believe that after to-night this description of policy will no longer be pursued with Oriental Sovereigns and semi-civilized nations. But we have other warnings. How is it that a person distinguished only as a military officer is chosen to fill the office of Consul? It may have been a proper reward for services, but the selection is evidently unfit. The responsibility of such appointments rests with the Government, and I trust that for the future persons better qualified will be chosen. It is perfectly evident that the matter must rest with the Government, and possibly the less said on the subject the better. I hope that our fellow-countrymen will be rescued from the position of danger and peril in which they are placed, and that in this respect the efforts of the Foreign Office may be crowned with success.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, that Consul Cameron had been a long time in the Consular service on the east coast of the Black Sea, had acquired great influence in that part of the country, and had shown himself well fitted to deal with half civilized tribes. He was not aware that he was a captain in Her Majesty's service, though he had been a volunteer in the defence of Kars. He thought his appointment as Consul a proper one. As a friend of that gentleman he protested against the course taken in quoting from despatches which had not been laid upon the table, reflecting upon Mr. Cameron. That was a most unusual practice, and his hon. Friend was not justified in resorting to it. As it was, Mr. Cameron would run the risk of being condemned on the faith of his hon. Friend's speech, but the House would do well to suspend its judgment until the despatches were laid upon the table, and hon. Members could judge for themselves. Mr. Cameron was sent out to Abyssinia in 1861, his instructions being to make Massowah his headquarters, and obtain a knowledge of the political state of Abyssinia. Now, if a gentleman was not to travel in the interior how could he make himself acquainted with the political state of the country? and if he was instructed to make Massowah his headquarters, did this not mean that he should travel elsewhere? His instructions really authorized him to go to the capital, Gondah, and the only charge made against him was that he stayed there too long; but no despatch had been received by him telling him to return. Mr. Cameron's despatches ought to be produced unmutilated, and it was to be hoped that they would be laid on the table. The Consul was found fault with for endeavouring to make a treaty with King Theodore and for encouraging the King to send an embassy to Europe, because it was supposed that he would ask our help in a war against Turkey. As to the treaty, it was difficult to understand why Mr. Cameron should be blamed for trying to do that which his predecessor had tried to do. With regard to the proposed embassy, the Under Secretary had spoken with a strong animus; but what had we to do with the question whether King Theodore was or was not at war with Turkey? It was only right to have heard what the King had to say on this subject before refusing his embassy. But, besides this, such a refusal was a piece of bad policy in treating with a country with which we had been on friendly terms. In the case of such a country as Abyssinia, an embassy to England encouraged friendly intercourse, and did great good; and the grounds alleged for refusing this embassy were wholly insufficient. He thought that good would have resulted from an embassy from Abyssinia. Merchants of eminence had assured him that advantages arose from the Japanese embassy, and he could not understand why this embassy from King Theodore had been refused. Then, no good reason had been shown for not answering King Theodore's letter, which was a most civil one. The Emperor of the French had been more polite, and it would have been quite possible for us to have sent an answer, giving King Theodore to understand that we were the friends of all nations, and that our wish was to cultivate commercial relations with his people. As to Mr. Rassam, he (Mr. H. Seymour) knew that gentleman, and had the highest opinion of him; but it was natural that when the King was at war with Turkey, he should be prejudiced against an Envoy from the English Government who was not a British subject, but a native of the country with which the King was at war. He thought, therefore, the selection of Mr. Rassam an unfortunate one. He should like to know the course the Government intended to pursue with regard to Captain Cameron. Did they intend to leave him in exile for an indefinite period because it was supposed he had misunderstood his instructions? Such a course would be rather severe. Nor did he understand from his hon. Friend that any attempts had been made to penetrate Abyssinia through Egypt. He should like to hear what steps the Government intended to take on the question.

THE DYCE SOMBRE CASE.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HENNESSY said, he wished to call attention to conduct on the part of the Secretary of State for India (Sir Charles Wood) which amounted, in his opinion, to a denial of justice, and an attempt to overrule the prerogative of the Crown as exercised by the Queen in Council. The right hon. Gentleman was unable to be present to-night from illness, but he understood that the Attorney General would represent him. The subject to which he wished to call the attention of the House involved a great delay of justice, and it concerned the property of the Begum Somroo. She had always been a faithful friend of the British Government, but on her death, in 1836, her estates were seized, and up to this time the Government of India had prevented the dispute which arose in consequence of that seizure being brought to a termination in the courts of law. To show the character of that lady, he need only refer to a letter from Lord William Bentinck, written to her the day before he left India, in which he spoke in the warmest terms of her charitable and benevolent disposition, and expressed a wish that she might long be spared to be a solace to the unfortunate. At her death, a large portion of her estates was seized by the British Government. They seized her papers also, and to this day had refused to give them up or allow copies to be taken of them. Mr. Dyce Sombre, her adopted son and her heir, who had received this property partly by deed of gift and partly by will, protested against this seizure, and furnished the Government with copies of the engagement between the Begum in 1805 and Lord Wellesley, and of other documents which showed that the property was his. Some delay occurred at the time. The matter was brought before the Home Government and the Court of Directors, and at length the Court of Directors decided that they were the owners of this property and refused to give it up. Mr. Dyce Sombre left untried no means of obtaining restitution, and when he became insane, the Lord Chancellor, acting on his behalf, instructed his solicitors in Calcutta to take the necessary proceedings against the British Government. This was in the autumn of 1847. When he died, the Government denied the rights of those who succeeded him, but that was got over, and the heirs-at-law of Mr. Dyce Sombre went on with the proceedings against the Government. But, though twenty-nine years had elapsed since the seizure was made, the case was still even unheard. This long delay was explained by the fact that the Government in India was accustomed to interfere with and control the highest Judges in India, in a manner which would not be tolerated here in the case of the meanest magistrate. They even selected Judges to try the cases in which they themselves were interested. The proceedings in this case furnished ample illustration of this kind of misconduct. When, after many difficulties interposed by the Government, it appeared that the case was at length about to be brought to trial, they adopted, in the first instance, the manœuvre of selecting the Judge who was to try it, and selected not the Judge who in ordinary course ought to have tried it. On the 13th of October, 1863, a telegram was sent by the Secretary at Bengal to the Commissioner at Delhi to this effect—

> "The Supreme Government have deputed Mr. Moorfield to conduct the Dyce Sombre case. You are to instruct Mr. Thornton to try it."

Mr. Thornton was at that time the Judge of the Small Causes Court at Delhi. And he was not the regular Judge who ought to have tried it. The person who ought to have tried it was Mr. Cooper, C.B., the Deputy Commissioner at Delhi, an eminent man among the Judges, and an officer of nearly seventeen years' standing; but the Government had ascertained that Mr. Cooper had already expressed an opinion on the merits of their case, to the effect that they had no case at all, and that restitution of the property ought to be made. The 3rd of November was fixed by Mr. Thornton for the trial of the case, but subsequently, being importuned by the Government, he postponed the hearing until the 2nd of January, 1864. He also called on the plaintiffs to produce the documentary evidence which they wished to supply, and ordered them to file fresh plaints in the case. Their plaints, in fact, had been filed seventeen years before, and the extraordinary ground assigned for the order was that the former plaints had been lost while in the custody of the Court. The plaintiff lost no time in filing fresh plaints. The pleas put in by the Government filed on the 4th of September, 1848, were partly objections to the jurisdiction of the Court, and also that the Statute of Limitations ran against the heirs of Dyce Sombre, and that the Court on that account could not try the case. They also pleaded that as the case had occurred in a certain district it ought to be tried there. The Government also pleaded that, twelve years having elapsed since the seizure, the question could not be tried at all. The courts in India decided against the Government on the question of jurisdiction, but on the plea of time gave a decision in favour of the Government. Upon appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided against the Government on the question of time, and the whole matter was remitted back to the courts in India, to proceed in the suit. He had mentioned the fact that delays were opposed to the progress of the suit by the conduct of the Judge selected in India; but he did not blame the Judge in any degree so much as Her Majesty's Government, because he found the Government over and over again asking for time, first for one period of six months, and then for another period of six months. In 1859 a memorial was presented to the Secretary of State praying him to cause the case to be decided under a certain clause in the India Act in this country; but that request was denied. Arbitration was proposed by the plaintiff, but refused by the Secretary of State because the papers were not in this country, but in India. But what took place in India? When the suit went on there, the Government made an application to the Court for six months' delay, on the ground that the papers were in England. He was sorry to say that the Judge of their own selection decided in their favour, and when Mr. Thornton, who had decided three or four times in favour of the Government on questions of delay, was promoted, nobody was surprised. On the 8th of October the case came before a new Judge—Captain M'Mahon—and the counsel acting for the Government was the Judge who had replaced Mr. Thornton in the Small Cause Court, and he applied for a further adjournment of six months, because the documents wanted from England had not yet arrived. However, the Judge would only grant a postponement from October to December. The Government then appealed against that decision to a Court which, he was informed, had no proper jurisdiction in the matter, and, up to the present moment, no decision had been given, so that, by lapse of time, the Government had obtained a greater delay than they at first applied for. The case was subsequently brought before another Judge—Mr. Nisbett—selected by the Government, instead of before Colonel Hamilton, the Commissioner at Delhi, a gentleman of great experience, because that gallant gentleman had been consulted by the Government, and had frankly given an opinion against them. Therefore, for the second time, the Government adopted a course disgraceful to themselves and destructive of the fair course of justice, and placed the case before an inferior Judge of their own selection. He had carefully abstained from going into the merits of the case, but he called on the Government, if they had any regard for their own character and the due course of justice, to give up their technicalities and to insist on this case being tried on its merits. It might be urged that the Queen in Council had already ordered the matter to be proceeded with, but the last plea put in by the Secretary of State for India, and filed on the 27th of April, 1865, set forth that the matters mentioned in the plaint were things done by the Government of India in their political capacity and as matters of State policy, and therefore the Court had no jurisdiction with regard to them. No doubt the Secretary of State had great power and influence, but he very much questioned whether the suit could be stopped in that way, seeing that the Queen in Council had ordered it to be proceeded with. He thought that a matter like this might fairly be brought before the House, and he asked the Secretary of State to re-consider his policy, and to direct the suit to be carried on with all possible dispatch.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he should be unable to give more than a general reply to the question of the hon. Gentleman, as there were many things which no one but the Secretary for India could deal with. He could only deal with general principles and the facts with which he was acquainted. He must, however, in the first instance, protest against any attempt to induce that House to pronounce an opinion upon matters still in progress of litigation, especially when the statements upon which it was asked to decide were *ex parte*, and made only in the interest of one party. Nothing could be more inconvenient than for the House to enter into such discussions of pending suits upon the invitation of any one party to the suit who could find an hon. Member to introduce the subject. It was totally impossible that under such circumstances the real facts could be known, and therefore it was simply an attempt to prepossess the minds of the House with ideas that might turn out to be utterly fallacious. He was not altogether unacquainted with the facts of this case, because he had been counsel for the plaintiff in the successful appeal before the Privy Council in 1858. The facts were briefly these. The Begum had been a feudatory of a Native Prince, and was allowed to retain her territory when the East India Company obtained possession of the country. Upon her death the Company took possession of that particular district of land, and of certain arms which they alleged to be public property, vested in her only as an incident of her feudal government, but the title to which on her death became extinct. A length of time elapsed before the question of right was raised, and for that delay the Indian Government were not responsible. At last two suits were instituted, one for the land and another for the arms, which were met, in the first instance, by the objection that they were barred by the lapse of time—twelve years having passed over. The decision of the Court in India upon that point was against the plaintiff, who then appealed to the Privy Council; but, instead of prosecuting the appeal with diligence, it was not until 1858 that it was heard, twenty years after the death of the Begum. The Privy Council, under the peculiar circumstances of the insanity of Mr. Dyce Sombre during a portion of the time, threw a certain part of the time out of consideration, and reversed the judgment of the Court in India upon the point of the Law of Limitations, leaving the other questions of jurisdiction and whether this was an Act of State, untouched. The case then went back to India, and the defence taken was that the property sued for was public property, and that consequently the Court had no jurisdiction. The instructions authorizing that defence to be taken went out from this country in

November, 1859, shortly after the change of Government, and they were the result of a consideration of the case during the tenure of office of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Stanley), than whom all would admit no one would be more candid, dispassionate, and just. It was the opinion of that noble Lord, or of those whom he consulted, that *primâ facie* the property in dispute was public property, and that the suits should be defended on that ground. Since then there might have been delays, no doubt caused in part by the necessity of making use of papers, some of which were in India, and some in England; for the papers were of course distributed over both countries. Moreover, in the meantime the Government of India had been changed, the mutiny had broken out and been suppressed, and the judicial system of the country had been altered, and possibly delays might have arisen from those causes. A pamphlet had been published upon this subject, which had been sent to Sir John Lawrence, who, in a letter to the Indian Government, stated that he was satisfied the Government could have no object in delay; but he believed there had been greater delays than ought to have occurred, which, however, he thought were attributable to the plaintiff as well as to the defendant. It really was most unreasonable to ask the House to form an opinion of the merits of a case like this, arising in a far distant country, after the lapse of many years from the occurrence of the events, and when the litigation was still proceeding. There could be no doubt that for the first twenty years the delay was attributable to the plaintiff. Litigation, whether with a Government or between individuals, generally occupied more time than was desirable, because its prolongation necessarily led to expense, and therefore it was for the advantage of all parties concerned that it should terminate as soon as possible. He thought the House would agree with Sir John Lawrence, who said it was absurd to suppose that the Government had endeavoured to cause delay for the sake of delay, and not to search for materials which it was very difficult to get together. He hoped there would be more dispatch in the future.

MR. BOVILL said, he agreed that it was inexpedient to call upon the House to consider questions which were being litigated before judicial tribunals, but would have been glad to have heard from the Attorney General a statement that the rights of the parties in the case would not be withdrawn from judicial investigation, but would be left to the decision of a judicial tribunal without further delay.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the Government did not seek to withdraw the case from the judicial tribunal. The merits of the case depended upon the fact whether it was an act of the State. If so, of course the judicial tribunals had no jurisdiction.

MR. BOVILL said, if it were an act of the State the Government might say there was no remedy by the ordinary tribunals, but in some recent cases it had been shown that where, by an act of the State, injustice or wrong was done there was a tribunal to which appeal could be made—the House of Commons. In the case of the Nawab of Surat such an appeal was made, and the result was the passing of an Act of Parliament. He admitted that the time had not come to consider the merits of this case, but he hoped one result of the discussion would be to prevent further delays, and to lead to some speedy and satisfactory termination of the suit.

MR. AYRTON said, that he had been counsel for the plaintiff in the appeal. He would not enter into the merits of the case, as they would probably have to be considered at a future time, when the House would be surprised to learn the remarkable conduct of the Indian Government in connection with a suit in which they were the defendants. He would only venture to hope that the suit might be allowed to proceed without further delays, and that if justice were not done in India the parties would be enabled to obtain it at the hands of that House.

TRANSPORT SERVICE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND INDIA.

MR. AYRTON said, that he had given notice of his desire to bring another subject connected with India before the House—namely, the course the Government was taking in setting up a steam communication between this country and India; but, in consequence of the absence of the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India (Sir Charles Wood) he was unable to proceed with it. The subject, however, was a most important one, and he was unwilling to postpone it without making a few observations. A Committee, presided over by his hon. Friend the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Lindsay), was appointed some years ago to consider the question of our transport service, and the Committee came to the conclusion that it was not desirable that Her Majesty should maintain a separate transport service, but that the Government should avail itself for this purpose of our commercial marine. Her Majesty's Government, however, instead of carrying out the recommendations of the Report, set it entirely aside, and had, in fact, commenced a transport service of great magnitude and cost. It was ascertained that the transport service, when performed by the Government, was attended by nearly double the expense which was incurred when the service was performed by contract. Not only, however, had the Government proposed entirely to dispense with the use of the mercantile marine, but one Department of the Government had actually entered into competition with another. The Secretary of State for India had, in fact, entered into active competition with the Postmaster General and the resources of the Treasury. This competition could not but increase the already heavy expenses incurred by the course which the Government had determined upon adopting. After destroying the Indian Navy, and incurring large expenditure in the shape of pensions, the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India now proposed setting up a quiet little marine of his own on the other side of the world. There were many other questions in connection with this subject which deserved a full consideration at the hands of the House, and none were more worthy of attention than was that of the postal communication between this country and India and China. While, however, he did not press on the subject at the present moment, he wished it to be distinctly understood that if he had the honour of sitting in the ensuing Parliament it would be his first concern to move for the appointment of a Committee upon this subject, and he trusted that the Government would not imagine that because he now abandoned it he had not any intention of proceeding with it at a future time.

Mr. T. G. BARING said, that as a Member of the Committee to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred, he could not but think that the hon. and learned Gentleman had not read the evidence adduced before that Committee or its Report. He assured him that the Report of the Committee did not in any way recommend

that the whole transport service should be conducted by the merchant service instead of by the Government. The evidence upon this point was very conflicting, and the Committee came to no conclusion whatever upon the subject. It was therefore clear that the proposal of the Secretary of State for India, which was now being carried out—namely, that the transport service of India should be carried on by the Government, was not in the least inconsistent with any recommendation of the Committee. On the contrary, he believed the policy of the right hon. Baronet to be a sound one. The course proposed to be adopted had been recommended by the military authorities and Government in India, and had received the approbation of the Indian Council. Their sending the troops by the overland route to India would be far more economical to the revenue, while at the same time it would give greater power of disposing of the whole force of the Empire. He could not understand the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman that the Secretary of State for India and the Postmaster General had entered into active competition. If the hon. and learned Gentleman referred to the passengers carried in the Government transports, he might state that those passengers would be the military troops, and the Government servants, and in proposing such a course there was surely nothing unfair. He could only say that the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India was perfectly ready to discuss the subject, and he felt convinced that the House would feel that the course pursued was the most economical one as well as one which would secure the greatest efficiency to the public service.

Motion *agreed to*:—House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

EAST INDIA (REVENUE) ACCOUNTS.

REPORT.

Resolutions [June 29] *reported*.

Mr. AYRTON said, he could assure the House that he was right in stating that the Transport Committee reported in favour of the employment of the commercial marine for the transport service, instead of Government vessels.

Resolutions *agreed to*.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 3, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Consolidated Fund (Appopriation)*; Harwich Harbour*(234); Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions)*(225); Penalties Law Amendment* 178).

Report — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions)* (225); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2)* (233).

Third Reading — Falmouth Borough* (201); Crown Suits* (187); Expiring Laws Continuance* (226); Poor Law Board Continuance* (227); Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment* (200); Colonial Docks Loans* (231); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (232); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (223).

SLAVERY.—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

LORD BROUGHAM craved permission, on what might be regarded as a personal matter, but what really was something more, to set himself right after some great misapprehension of what had passed on the subject of slavery in the United States; because he was assured by persons of note from that country that the charge made against him of taking part with the slave-mongers of the South was certain to lessen the influence, such as it was, of his earnest entreaty to the Government of the North, that they would use their great victory with moderation and mercy. He show a leaning towards the slavemongers of the South!—he, who was well known to have abandoned a kind gift of a Barbadoes plantation, and an estate in Durham, because he would not abandon the cause of slave emancipation and slave trade abolition, and his friends and fellow labourers in that great cause! The notion was beyond measure absurd; but he could imagine how it arose. He differed from many respected friends on two points. Highly as he praised the noble conduct of the North in granting the right of search which was directed against the Cuba slave trade, and greatly as he approved the proclamation against slavery, he had always maintained that it was not issued on behalf of the slaves, but as a measure of hostility against the South, and had for its object the restoration of the Union, not the good of the negro. So he differed with the same friends on the conduct of the South, which they contended was wholly actuated by the desire to maintain slavery, while he contended that this was only in part the cause of the secession, which was in great part for obtaining their independence. He had in that very address at the Social Science Congress of York, which was referred to as an authority for these misrepresentations, called slavery the detested institution of the South, but these words were suppressed. In praising the North for their conduct, he had felt called upon to express his horror of the treatment to which the unhappy negroes were subjected, when driven in multitudes to slaughter during the war fortunately now ended. Exaggeration and perversion are the very life of party, and he who casts himself loose from its trammels, and is resolved to see facts in their proper colour and just dimensions, will stand aloof from siding with either party, and is pretty certain to be misrepresented by both.

STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LORD REDESDALE, in accordance with his promise on the previous Monday, said he was happy to state that the expectation he had held out, that the Private business would be disposed of before the close of the Session, was in a fair way of being accomplished. He believed that there were only three Bills before Committees; and he hoped that they would go to the Commons to-morrow.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he could not allow the statement of the noble Lord to pass without saying that he felt sure that the thanks of the House were due to the noble Lords who had attended upon the Committees, and especially to the noble Lord himself.

THE BURIAL SERVICE.

LORD EBURY, in moving the following Resolution—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the Evils arising from the compulsory and almost indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service of the Church of England, demand the early attention of the Legislature,"

said, that he rose to propose the Motion of which he had given notice under a strong sense of the disadvantages under which he laboured. He knew he should be told—indeed, he had been told already—that at this late period of the Session he ought not to bring forward a question of so much importance, and he was well aware how fatally that argument told against an unofficial, uninfluential Member of their Lordships' House. At the same time he would observe that although, no doubt, they had arrived nearly at the termination of the Session, yet they had not arrived at a period of the year when a fair attendance of Peers, both spiritual and lay, could not reasonably be expected; and, as they were not permitted to interfere in elections, and had no elections of their own to encounter, he did not think that their Lordships would permit that objection to stand in his way should he succeed in making out the case of urgency which the terms of the Resolution implied. Moreover, let it be remembered by their Lordships, that he was not proposing a Bill which would have to go through various stages, nor a new subject of which the House might be supposed not to understand all the bearings, but one which had come under discussion in their Lordships' House both this year and last year and the year before last, and, what was still more to the purpose, one in regard to which their Lordships had pronounced a decision favourable to the views which he was putting forth; and he said so for this reason, that when he made a Motion two years ago for a Commission to suggest a remedy for the evils which arose from the indiscriminate and compulsory use of the Burial Service, fifteen noble Lords took part in the debate. Of those thirteen, including both the Primates and three other Spiritual Peers, declared their opinion that he had made out his case, and that the time was come when a remedy for the evils which he detailed ought to be sought for and discovered; and of the remaining two, one objected, not to the subject-matter of the Motion, but to the propriety of this House discussing the subject; while the other, a noble and learned Lord, simply addressed himself to a point of law. Although two years had since elapsed, the House would not have forgotten either the cases—those painful scenes—with which the right rev. Prelate who presided over the diocese of Llandaff illustrated his own argument and his (Lord Ebury's) by the painful case he had instanced, nor the emphatic declarations of the most rev. the Primate of all England, that he had often been consulted on the subject, and that he had always said there were circumstances under which he should be prepared to face all the penalties of the law sooner than comply with its requirements as to reading the service. He (Lord Ebury) did not press his Motion, because he was most earnestly appealed to by the most rev. Prelate, and by nearly all who spoke, to give a little more time, that a remedy might be devised by the Prelates of our Church, whose attention it was about to occupy; and he well remembered the words used by his own right rev. Diocesan. Especially appealing to him, he said he might be sure, from the speeches made by the occupants of the right rev. Bench, that the subject would not be allowed to drop. Not to trouble the House with too many details, their Lordships knew the sequel. Nothing had been done to effect the settlement of this question. Two years had passed away, and from the return given to a question which he asked the most rev. Prelate a few days ago, there appeared to be no reasonable expectation of any proposition coming—as they all had fondly hoped it would come—from the right rev. Bench. And so this state of things, which had been pronounced by some 4,000 clergymen to impose a heavy burden upon the consciences of clergymen, and a grievous scandal to many Christian people, seemed likely to remain so to the end of time. He hoped the occupants of the right rev. Bench would not suppose for a moment that he meant to impute to them that they acquiesced in this state of affairs. Very far from it, nothing, he knew, would give them greater pleasure than to bring forward an effective remedy; but, in truth, they were in a dilemma, out of which he invited their Lordships to assist them. The most rev. Prelate had told the House fairly what that dilemma was. The majority of their clergy were opposed to the only practical remedy—namely, an alteration in the wording of the service. Now, let them study this subject by the light of a speech made not very long ago by one of the most sagacious Prelates now on the Bench, and see whether there might not be a means of overcoming the difficulty. The Bishop of London said —

"The clergy necessarily from their profession, were averse to change, and he was thankful for it; and even those changes which were good might not receive from them that amount of favour on their first proposal which, after alterations made by their superiors, they were willing to accord to them. It was doubtful whether, with regard to some very salutary reforms which had taken place in the Church, such as those relating to pluralities and non-residence, if the decision had rested with the whole body of the clergy, that properly conservative spirit which animated them would not have led them to say that the safer course was to let things remain as they were. He thought it would be wise, on the part of the Government, to take the question into their own hands, giving due weight—but not too much weight—to the opinions of the clergy."

Again, the right rev. Prelate said—

> "Such a state of things ought not to be allowed to continue, and judging by the mode in which the other intricate questions of clerical subscription had been dealt with, and the way in which, when the Commission had commenced its sittings, one difficulty after another had in that case disappeared, there was good reason to hope that, if this question were dealt with in a similar mode, the difficulties which now beset it would likewise disappear."

Here, then, was the first step towards the solution of this question—that their Lordships should pass this Resolution. No one could deny the truth of it; no Government would venture to disregard it. The Government would advise Her Majesty to issue a Commission, as she did in the case of clerical subscription, and they would not have long to wait before this question would be finally and satisfactorily disposed of. Their Lordships could easily imagine that, crying as were the evils arising from this state of things twelve years ago, when this clerical memorial was presented at Lambeth, they had become even more aggravated since. Instances without number of painful scenes which had occurred at funerals in consequence of nothing having been done in the meantime, such as those described by the right rev. Prelate on a former occasion, had been made known to him, one of which he had mentioned to the House; but he would forbear to cite more than one, and that one of very recent date, with which probably many of their Lordships were familiar. He meant that of Colyton, in Devonshire. The incumbent of Colyton, it appeared, was a man, as he understood, of irreproachable character, entertaining rather extreme High Church views, and consequently zealous for the law. Therefore he did as the law directed: thirteen times he was required to read the Athanasian Creed — thirteen times every year, with the assistance of his congregation, he consigned three parts at least of the human race—past, present, and future — to everlasting perdition, including, of course, the Unitarians, against whom he believed this creed to have been specially directed. Their Lordships, then, would judge of this clergyman's feelings when, walking out of his church after reading this creed—on Whitsunday or on Trinity Sunday—his sexton informed him that one of his parishioners, a Unitarian, had died, and was to be buried in a day or two. Mr. Gueritz had just pronounced that this man would perish everlastingly, and he was now required to say of the same man, and before the same congreation, that he committed the body of his dear brother to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life and happiness in the world to come. Was ever an unhappy clergyman put into such a position? How long it took Mr. Gueritz to decide I am unable to say, but I have no doubt that, feeling he was acting up to the advice of his metropolitan, and that he would in so doing have the approbation of every honest man, he determined to brave the penalties of the law sooner than pronounce these words over an Unitarian; and so he did brave the penalties of the law, and the law fell upon him. He did not, because he could not, defend himself, and so he was cited before the proper tribunal, admonished, and condemned to pay the costs of the suit. All comment upon such a state of things was simply superfluous. He appealed to their Lordships whether he had not made out a case of urgency; he felt confident what their response would be. How many more clergymen would their Lordships require to have fined before it would please them to move in the matter? The Rubrics owed their validity to their being statute law, and this state of things was caused by the Legislature; by legislation alone could it be healed. Their Lordships could not divest themselves of their responsibilities. He, therefore, invited them to pass this Resolution. The right rev. Bench appeared to be powerless in the matter; it was necessary the Government should take it up, and, if they passed this Resolution, no Government would venture to disregard it.

Moved to Resolve, That, in the opinion of this House, the Evils arising from the compulsory and almost indiscriminate Use of the Burial Service of the Church of England demand the early Attention of the Legislature.—(*The Lord Ebury.*)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he fully appreciated the wish which the noble Lord had expressed to place the question which he had brought forward in his hands. So far as related to his Motion, however, he must say that he did not think it was desirable to bring a matter so important forward at so late a period of the Session, when so many of their Lordships, and the great majority of the Episcopal Bench, were necessarily absent from town attending to other duties. It was not at that moment necessary to enter into an elaborate discussion of the question, because it would require more consideration than it was likely to receive at this period of the Session, and could not be settled in the manner proposed by his noble Friend. He ventured to say that the injury of the case was not such as his noble Friend had represented. No conscience would be relieved, no difficulty would be got over by the adoption of this Motion, and, therefore, he invited their Lordships not to adopt a Resolution which, as far as any effect was concerned, would be entirely nugatory.

EARL GRANVILLE said, it was perfectly impossible for those of their Lordships who recollected what had passed in that House on previous occasions on the subject of the Burial Service not to acknowledge that there was a grievance. It was undoubtedly an anomalous state of things that clergymen were induced to disregard the law from conscientious motives, and were sanctioned in so doing by those who had authority over them, and that no attempt should be made to amend it. At the same time, when a noble Lord called upon Her Majesty's Government to come to the assistance of the Episcopal Bench, all he had to say was that Her Majesty's Government were ready to assist in any manner they could. They were only anxious that the right rev. Bench would be able to suggest some mode of dealing with the evil complained of. The Government were quite prepared to issue a Commission upon the subject, but he understood that the right rev. Prelates would not be satisfied with such Commission unless another question connected with the Rubrics of the Church were referred to it. With regard to the present Motion, he must say he thought it undesirable in the last week of the Session that their Lordships should be called upon to pass a Resolution condemning an evil, and stating that it ought to be remedied, but which did not suggest a remedy. He therefore hoped his noble Friend would withdraw his Motion.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, the only remark he wished to make was in relation to what had passed on a former occasion. It appeared likely that a Commission was to be issued to consider certain Rubrics of the Church, and he thought in such a case it would be desirable that this matter should fall under the consideration of that Commission. He thought that his noble Friend would be acting properly by withdrawing his Motion, on the understanding that when some matters connected with the Rubrics of the Church were submitted to the consideration of a Commission this subject would not be ignored.

EARL GREY thought that the noble Lord (Lord Ebury) had made out sufficient reason for his Motion, for according to the acknowledgment of the right rev. Bench the present state of the law was such as to occasion considerable inconvenience. Was it fitting that they should maintain a law which conscientious men either broke, and thereby made themselves liable to penalties, or induced them to do that which was directly contrary to their consciences? When they remembered how long it was since his noble Friend first brought this subject under the attention of Parliament—when they remembered what little hope was held out of any remedy being applied to an acknowledged evil, unless that House pressed for the introduction of some measure, it appeared to him that there was hardly the faintest hope that any remedy would be applied. It appeared to him that the time had come when something might be done on the subject, and that the Resolution of his noble Friend was one of the most moderate character that could be brought forward. Therefore he could not recommend him to accept the advice that had been given to him to withdraw his Motion. He did not think there was anything in the objection as to the time it was introduced.

LORD EBURY said, that upon a previous occasion he had withdrawn a Resolution which he proposed because he received an assurance from the right rev. Bench that they would take up the question. The right rev. Prelate who presided over the diocese of London especially said, that he might be sure that the subject would not be allowed to drop. The subject had, however, been allowed entirely to drop. He could not take the responsibility of the existing state of things. His Motion had the concurrence of the most rev. Prelate who presided over the Northern Province of the kingdom. Unless he received an assurance that a Commission would be issued, he must certainly divide their Lordships upon it.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:* —Contents 20; Not-Contents 43: Majority 23:— *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Westminster, M.

Chichester, E.
Cowper, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Minto, E.

Torrington, V.

Churchill, L.
Congleton, L.
Ebury, L. [*Teller.*]
Foley, L.

Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Harris, L.
Leigh, L.
Methuen, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Sandys, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Wentworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.

Westbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Cleveland, D.
Somerset, D.

Bandon, E.
Derby, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Home, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Wilton, E.

De Vesci, V.
Gort, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V. [*Teller.*]

Ely, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Aveland, L.
Boston, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Denman, L.
Egerton, L.
Hatherton, L.
Heytesbury, L.
Raglan, L.
Rollo, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]
Sondes, L.
Wenlock, L.

COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

EARL COWPER rose to move for a list of those Lords who had served on Private Bill Committees during the present Session of Parliament, and the number of times that each Lord had served; and to call the attention of the House to the question whether it was not desirable that it should be compulsory upon each Member of the House, with certain exceptions, to serve, if required, on a Private Bill Committee once during each Session of Parliament? The arrangement of which he suggested the adoption worked admirably in another place, and he believed that it would operate with equal advantage in their Lordships' House. It might be objected that while no man need become a Member of the other House, and consequently become liable to the performance of these duties unless he pleased, their Lordships were born Peers. But, apart from the somewhat trite observation that rank had its duties as well as its rights, no Peer need take his seat unless he chose, and if he did not take his seat he would not have to serve on these Committees. Perhaps he might be told that there was no difficulty in getting Peers to do all the work that was necessary; but the great majority of their Lordships never attended at all, and those who did the work could not help feeling that some injustice was inflicted upon them. In the early part of the Session there was always a very small attendance, and the speaking was almost entirely confined to the Members of the Government and one or two other noble Lords. There was a great number of Peers who had nothing else to do, and they might as well come down to that House as go anywhere else. He had no doubt that the fear of being called upon to serve on Private Bill Committees kept many of them away, and probably if the duty of serving upon such Committees were better distributed that fear would operate less than it did at present.

Moved, "That there be laid upon the table a List of those Lords who have served on Private Bill Committees during the present Session of Parliament, and the Number of Times that each Lord has served; and to call the Attention of the House to the Question, whether it is not desirable that it should be compulsory upon each Member of the House, with certain Exceptions, to serve, if required, on a Private Bill Committee once during each Session of Parliament?"

EARL GRANVILLE said, that the noble Earl (Earl Cowper) could, after the speech which he had just delivered, have no excuse for not in future taking a more prominent part than he had hitherto done in the debates of their Lordships' House. He believed that the system which the noble Earl had recommended worked very well in the other House, and that arrangements were made at the commencement of each Session by which the convenience of Members was consulted as to the time of the year at which they would prefer to serve upon Committees; and he was afraid that the practice followed in their Lordships' House operated injuriously by throwing the work upon a small number of Peers. Practically there was no difficulty in getting a sufficient number of Members of their Lordships' House to form the necessary Committees, but there was in the minds of those who acted a feeling that they were doing the whole of a work of which others ought to take a share. He heartily agreed in the observations of the noble Earl as to the general thin attendance of noble Lords in the House. A very distinguished Member of the other House, who was present at a great debate, when the Benches on both sides of their Lordships' House were crammed with Peers, said, "What a power the House of Lords would be if they constantly sat in numbers such as this!" The younger Peers were sometimes reluctant to attend the meetings of their Lordships' House from the fear of being called upon to serve on Committees out of their course; and that fear aggravated by their belief that if they consented to serve an unequal share of the burden would be thrown upon them. He (Earl Granville) had been informed by several Lords, not anxious to shirk business, that it was this fear that caused them to absent themselves. The best course for the noble Earl to adopt would be to confine his Motion at present to asking for the Return mentioned in his Motion, and next Session to move that the subject should be referred to a Select Committee, by whom the question would be carefully inquired into.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, it was formerly the practice in their Lordship's House to enforce the attendance of Peers by penalties, but this was dropped from finding that it did not work well, and the present plan of voluntary attendance had been followed of late years. He thought that some means should certainly be adopted to secure the attendance of Peers on Committees, but at the same time wished to point out that the health of the Peers who did attend ought to be taken into account by the introduction of improvements in the Committee rooms. He had written to the First Commissioner of Works to point out the necessity for the windows being opened at the top, but regretted to find that, with the exception of one small room, this had not been done. The Committee rooms were inconvenient and badly ventilated. If a Committee were appointed next Session it might mitigate the evils complained of.

LORD EGERTON said, he agreed that the best course to be adopted would be to move for a Committee on the subject. If their Lordships required any change they must so arrange that more business should be originated in their House, and not allow the great mass of the private Bills to be commenced in the other House, and then thrown upon them all at once late in the Session. Perhaps, if a Committee were appointed, and a conference arranged between the two Houses, some improvements might be effected.

EARL STANHOPE entirely acquiesced in the observations of the noble Lords who had preceded him, that the present system under which the private business of their Lordships' House was conducted was most unsatisfactory. It was not fair that noble Lords who were perfectly capable of discharging the duties of the House should absent themselves, and so throw the burden altogether upon the few Peers who did attend, putting, at the same time, an undue pressure upon the noble Lord the Chairman of the Committees. But this was not a matter which ought to be decided hastily, and the suggestion of the Lord President was a good one; and he hoped the noble Earl who had made the Motion would endeavour next year to have the matter referred to a Select Committee.

LORD REDESDALE said, no Member of their Lordship's House would be more relieved by the change proposed by the noble Earl (Earl Cowper) than himself; but, at the same time, it was his duty to express his entire dissent from the alteration suggested. As one who had been a Member of the Nomination Committee ever since 1838, he could say that the present system had worked well for the public, and that the Committees of this House where the attendance was voluntary, gave more satisfaction to the public than the Committees of the other House, where the attendance was compulsory. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than compulsory attendance. He recollected that in one instance, where a noble Lord had been compelled to attend a Committee, he was found to be perfectly useless, and he was afraid if they were to make the attendance generally compulsory, the public would be the sufferers. It would be impossible to commence a very much larger number of Bills in their Lordships' House, as at the beginning of the Session there were but few Peers in town, and it would be difficult to obtain good Chairmen of the Committees. At present the division of the business was regulated by agreement between the two Houses, and such an amount of business was appointed to commence in their Lordships' House as would occupy them until the time when the business from the other House would begin to come in, which was generally shortly after Easter. The business from the House did not come in all at once, as had been stated, but came in a constant stream, so that their Lordships were kept steadily employed from about Easter down to the end of the Session. He must also say that a large number of their Lordships did sit upon Committees. After all, the question was, in what manner Chairmen of Committees were to be found; for, if there was not a good Chairman of a Committee, the compulsory attendance of Peers would be most unsatisfactory. It might seem an unpleasant duty to try to form a Committee; but, in his twenty-seven years' experience of the duty, he must say that he had never met with an uncivil or uncourteous reply, and though the duty was laborious and ungracious he was still willing to discharge it. In reply to the suggestion of the noble Lord that young Peers were prevented from attending their Lordships' House by the fear of being compelled to serve on Committees, he might say that no Peer was required to serve more than once in each Session unless he showed a disposition to serve more frequently. If the attendance was compulsory there could not be less than one service, and no pressure was put on any one at the present time. For these reasons he thought that the voluntary service was preferable; and that if any one had a right to complain, it was the Chairman of Committees. He hoped the noble Earl would amend his Motion by striking out its compulsory clause, and by adding to the Return he moved for the number of days each Lord had sat.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, the Return moved for by the noble Earl should include the names of those Peers who had sat upon Select Committees, as well as those who had sat upon Private Committees. A great deal of business was done in Select Committees. The Return, as proposed, might lead to the supposition that the Peers named in it were the only Peers who had served on Committees, which would be unjust. He agreed with the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees that the attendance should not be made compulsory.

EARL COWPER said, he would adopt the suggestion of the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, and would omit from his Motion the passage making the attendance of Peers compulsory, and would move that the Return should include the number of days on which each noble Lord had sat on one of their Lordships' private Committees.

Motion amended, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That there be laid upon the Table a List of those Lords who have served on Private Bill Committees during the present Session of Parliament; and the Number of Times that each Lord had served; and the Number of Days he sat on every such Committee.—(*The Earl Cowper.*)

TITLES TO LAND IN INDIA; QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE inquired, Whether the Governor General of India has taken steps to inquire into Titles to Land in other Parts of India similar to those which were adopted in the Province of Oude? He believed that, above all things, it was desirable in legislating for India to lay down no particular rule for the government of the whole country; but that, in the regulation of each portion, regard should be had to the usages, customs, and laws already existing. It should also be remembered that the talookdars were men of wealth and position.

LORD DUFFERIN said, that whenever a newly acquired territory passed under the jurisdiction of the Indian Government it was the practice to dispatch a staff of revenue officers and surveyors for the purpose of effecting what was commonly called a settlement of the territory—that was to say, of measuring the various areas which were about to become the subject of the land tax, and ascertaining the parties who were responsible for the payment of that tax. That course was taken, first, for the purposes of fiscal assessment, and, secondly, in order to record existing rights. The agricultural population of India was divided, as in Europe, into two great classes—landlords and tenants. But the class of tenants was again subdivided into three distinct categories—tenants at will, tenants with rights of occupancy at fixed rates lower than the market rate, and tenants who had rights of occupancy at what were called fair or marketable rates—rates determined by the arbitration of a Court of Justice. The rights of tenants of the last class, although not of great importance, were still of considerable value. But those of tenants at fixed rates were, no doubt, of a very valuable character, and were transferred by the tenant to his descendants. Consequently, it was the custom of the Government of India, whenever a settlement was effected, to send an officer to record, not only the rights of the proprietors, but those of the occupying tenants. As early as 1836 instructions to that effect were given by Lord Auckland, and afterwards confirmed by Lord Hardinge and other Governors General. Lord Canning also expressly reserved the subsidiary rights of this class of occupiers. It was, therefore, a mistake to imagine that the policy which had been pursued by Sir John Lawrence was a reversal of that which had been adopted by Lord Canning. It was, in fact, merely an extension and confirmation, of that policy. When the time arrived for the final settlement of Oude, and Mr. Wingfield reported to the Government on the subject, it occurred to Sir John Lawrence to ask whether he had made any investigation as to the rights of occupancy? As Mr. Wingfield was himself perfectly satisfied, from his knowledge of the country, that no such rights existed, he had not instituted any inquiry into the subject, but Sir John Lawrence had thought it expedient to institute a more special inquiry. That inquiry had been conducted in the fairest and most impartial manner under the superintendence of Mr. Davies, a revenue officer, and the result was that Mr. Wingfield's previous opinion had been to a great extent confirmed. With regard to the second point, whether special instructions had been sent to the Governor General to make a similar inquiry into the title of land elsewhere than in Oude, he was able to reply in the negative. The revenue officers in India would continue to act, not under special instructions, but under the general instructions which he had detailed. There was great discrepancy of opinion both in India and at home as to the policy of encouraging tenant right, but into that question it was not necessary now to enter. He hoped he had satisfied his noble Friend as to the matters of fact which were the subject of his inquiries.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 3, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [254].

Committee—Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [254]; Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [251]; Rochdale Vicarage * [*Lords*] [252].

Report — Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [254]; Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment * [*Lords*] [251]; Rochdale Vicarage * [*Lords*] [252].

Lord Dufferin

STANDING ORDERS.

Standing Order No. 60 read.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN moved to rescind Standing Order No. 60, and to insert the following Standing Order in lieu thereof:—

Resolved, That in the case of a Railway Bill authorizing the construction of works by other than an existing Railway Company incorporated by Act of Parliament, and which has, during the year last past, paid dividends on its ordinary share capital a sum not less than 8 per cent on the amount of the Estimate of Expense, and in the case of all Bills, other than Railway Bills, a sum not less than 4 per cent on the amount of such Estimate, shall, previously to the 15th day of January, be deposited with the Court of Chancery in England, if the work is intended to be done in England, or with the Court of Chancery in England, or the Court of Exchequer in Scotland, if such work is intended to be done in Scotland, and with the Court of Chancery in Ireland, if such work is intended to be done in Ireland. (See Appendix C.)—(*Colonel Wilson Patten.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the said Resolution be a Standing Order of this House.

MR. WINSLOW'S PENSION.

QUESTION.

Major STUART KNOX said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether it is true that a pension has been granted by the Lord Chancellor to Mr. Winslow, late one of the Masters in Lunacy; and, if so, the amount of such pension, the grounds upon which it was granted, and whether it was refused by a former Chancellor?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, the pension granted by the present Lord Chancellor to Mr. Winslow is one of £1,000 a year, by an order made upon the 3rd of February, 1863. The grounds upon which it was granted were these:—Mr. Winslow served for nearly thirty years, thirteen of which were in the office of Commissioner of Lunacy, and seventeen more as Master in Lunacy. On the 4th of February, 1859, he presented a petition to Lord Chancellor Chelmsford, stating that he desired to retire upon a pension, and that he was labouring under serious and permanent infirmities. That petition was supported by unexceptional certificates from two physicians and one surgeon. Before, however, anything was done upon that petition, Mr. Winslow was obliged to resign his office, owing to the pressure of pecuniary difficulties; and Lord Chancellor

Chelmsford afterwards left office without making any order upon it. Therefore, according to the information I have received, it is not correct, as assumed by the question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, that any former Lord Chancellor ever refused this pension. Under these circumstances there followed a delay in the prosecution of the petition of rather more than two years. On the 31st of July, 1862, the present Lord Chancellor received a further petition from Mr. Winslow, supported by affidavits and strong letters and testimonials, urging the claims of Mr. Winslow for long and valuable services. Those letters were from Lord Brougham, Lord Lyndhurst, under whom he had served, Lord Justice Knight Bruce, Vice Chancellor Stuart, the Lord Chief Baron, Mr. Montagu Smith, Mr. Bovill, Mr. Malins, and Mr. Commissioner Holroyd. Lord Chelmsford also wrote a letter to Mr. Commissioner Holroyd, saying—

> "That it would give him great pleasure to see that the Lord Chancellor had taken a favourable view of Mr. Winslow's petition, and that he believed it would be gratifying to the whole profession."

With these papers before him, the Lord Chancellor, having obtained the opinion of a very eminent counsel, Mr. Bacon, on his authority to deal with the case, and having also advised with the Law Officers of the Crown, made an order upon the two petitions, after deliberate consideration, granting a pension, not at the maximum of £1,200 a year, but at £1,000 or £200 less.

IRELAND—THE DINNER TO MR. GAVAN DUFFY.—QUESTION.

MR. VERNER said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been given to the proceedings which are stated to have taken place at a public dinner in Dublin in honour of Mr. Gavan Duffy, at which the health of Her Majesty was reluctantly and not very respectfully proposed, and received with general hissing and disapprobation, and likewise to the presence there of two Members of that House, the Members for Youghal and Dungarvan, the former one of Her Majesty's Counsel, and the latter holding the Commission of the Peace, neither of whom is represented to have expressed disapproval of the disloyal conduct of the assembly, and what steps the Irish Government intend to take in the matter?

SIR ROBERT PEEL: Sir, since the hon. Member gave notice of his Question I have taken care to look to the proceedings referred to. The dinner was of a private character. ["No, no!"] At all events, it was a dinner to a gentleman who had been absent from Ireland for, I believe, many years. He was entertained at the private expense of the parties. Reporters were there, but I am not responsible for the observations of the hon. Members for Youghal and Dungarvan. I should suggest that the hon. Gentleman would address the inquiries he has made of me to those hon. Members. These two hon. Gentlemen, out of regard to Mr. Duffy, attended at the dinner and made speeches, but I see nothing in their speeches to find fault with. As regards the toast of "Her Majesty," I believe it was given; but really I am not in any way responsible for the course of the proceedings at an entertainment of this kind.

IRELAND—THE LAW ADVISER TO THE CASTLE.—QUESTION.

SIR THOMAS BATESON said, he had taken the following passages from the speech of the candidate for Dungarvan on the 17th of June, as given in the *Freeman's Journal*. The passages were—

> "I have learnt from my earliest youth to regard with undying hostility the arrogant and intolerant faction which so long has trampled upon and insulted my religion and my country. . . . I regard the tenant farmer as the sole proprietor of the land, where he indutriously tills and labours upon it."

He wished to ask the right hon. Baronet the Secretary for Ireland, Whether the gentleman who delivered that speech was the same Mr. Barry who held the office of Law Adviser to the Castle, and who was selected by the Government to go down to Belfast to hold a judicial investigation involving the lives of many men to whom he declares his "undying hostility" — the same Mr. Barry who was so lauded by the occupants of the Treasury Bench for his impartiality, his moderation, and his judicial qualifications? He also wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman considered a person who alluded to his "undying hostility" to a great number of his fellow-countrymen, and who held the most advanced socialistic doctrines with regard to the rights of property, was a fit person to hold the office of Law Adviser to Dublin Castle?

SIR ROBERT PEEL, in reply, said, he told the hon. Baronet on Friday night that he should be prepared to meet the Question. In the first place, he must disclaim altogether having it supposed that Mr. Barry was a Government candidate. Mr. Barry was a very eminent gentleman, and was one of the Commissioners who had been sent to Belfast, and every one acknowledged that the Report of the Commissioners was a most impartial and fair one. Mr. Barry was now candidate for Dungarvan; but in the present exciting times Mr. Barry, probably like other gentlemen, had language attributed to him which he had never made use of. He had Mr. Barry's authority for saying that he did not make use of the language attributed to him; and, moreover, Mr. Barry had, since the date of the observations referred to, issued an address to the electors of Dungarvan, on the 28th of June, in which he stated that language had been attributed to him which he had not uttered, and opinions which he never entertained. That was a satisfactory answer, he trusted, to the observations made by the hon. Baronet; and it was quite evident that the hon. Gentleman would have done better by privately asking him, whether the language attributed to Mr. Barry had been used before bringing the subject under the notice of the House?

THE GRAND JUNCTION CANAL BASIN.

QUESTION.

MR. W. EWART said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether the attention of the Privy Council has been called to a Memorial from St. Mary's Hospital, and also a Report from the Paddington Vestry, respecting the nuisance to health arising from the foul state of the Grand Junction Canal Basin, and of the wharves adjoining, in the parish of Paddington, and whether they are about to take any steps in relation thereto?

MR. H. A. BRUCE said, in reply, that the attention of the Privy Council had been called to the state of the Canal Basin and the water in it, and to the fact that the local authority for sanitary purposes stated that they were unable to suppress the nuisance. A communication was therefore addressed by the Privy Council to the vestry, who explained the steps they had taken during the last fifteen years with regard to the nuisance, and added, that they were now instituting another proceeding, in the nature of an indictment. It was to be hoped that those proceedings would have the desired effect. In the meanwhile it should be known that the medical department of the Privy Council had no other power than that of inquiring into the facts of such cases.

CONVENTION OF FOREIGN LAW.

QUESTION.

MR. J. J. POWELL said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any Convention has been entered into with Foreign Governments for the purpose of procuring an authoritative explanation on points of Foreign Law at issue in any case or suit now pending in this country?

MR. LAYARD said, in reply, the subject was one of considerable importance, and Her Majesty's Government had been in communication with most of the Foreign Governments with reference to it. The papers had been laid before the Lord Chancellor, but no Convention had yet been entered into.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, as Chairman of the Committee upon that Ecclesiastical Commission of 1863, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government intend to pay any attention to the Report of that Commission, and its charges of land jobbing and other delinquencies?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that the attention of the Government had been called to the Report of the Committee on the subject of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and he had called on the Commissioners, soon after the Report was presented, for an explanation of certain matters alluded to in that Report. He was under the impression that their reply had been laid on the table, but, if not, it should be. A Bill had been prepared, the object of which was to centre the responsibility in the Estates' Committee, but that Bill required a good deal of consideration, and during the recess he hoped to complete its details.

LEEDS BANKRUPTCY COURT, &c.

RESOLUTION.

MR. HUNT: Sir, in rising to move the Resolution of which I have given notice, I cannot disguise from myself the grave nature of the task I have undertaken. That Resolution is, in fact, a vote of censure upon one of the highest functionaries of State—upon that functionary who is called the Keeper of the Queen's Conscience, the Supreme Judge of the Court of Chancery, one who acts in a twofold capacity in the House of Lords—as the supreme Judge of the highest court of judicature in the kingdom, and the Speaker of that august Assembly in its deliberations upon public affairs. To direct a vote of censure upon so high a functionary is, I say, a grave matter, and I have not undertaken to do so without duly considering the responsibility I thus incur. If I have undertaken this task lightly, frivolously, or upon insufficient grounds, the censure will recoil upon my own head. On the other hand, if I can show that there are real and substantial grounds for proposing this Resolution, then, I think, I shall only have discharged my duty to the country.

Now, Sir, it is obviously of the highest importance, not only that there should be purity in the exercise of the high functions of the Lord Chancellor, but vigilance against corruption by his subordinates. It is of high importance, because of the enormous amount of patronage which has accumulated in his hands. He holds the appointment of nearly every Judge who sits upon the bench in this country—the Judges of the land, of the County Court Judges, the Judges in Bankruptcy, and a multitude of subordinate officers in those Courts, and these appointments tell upon the interests of nearly all the people of this country. Therefore, I say it is most important that the person who discharges the high duties which attach to the office of Lord Chancellor should not only be himself incorrupt, but should be vigilant in the public interest to prevent corruption among those about him. I am happy to say that on this occasion I am not here to impute personal corruption to the Lord Chancellor; but I am here to impute to him that he has not shown that vigilance, that acuteness, and that anxiety for the public interest which his high station and the important duties attached to it imperatively demand. I think I need hardly apologize for bringing under review the conduct of the Lord Chancellor, because it must be admitted that a *primâ facie* case for that course exists when in one Session of Parliament a Committee of each House has sat to inquire into the purity of his conduct. I bring the question of the two cases before the House on the present occasion. We must remember that the Committee of either House had referred to it only the inquiry into the particular case which was under its investigation; but we have now the advantage of being able to compare the evidence given before the two Committees, and what might seem a slight affair when we had only the evidence adduced before one Committee becomes a grave matter when we read the Report of the other Committee and the evidence given before it. We cannot go entirely by the Report of the Lords' Committee, or by that of the Commons' Committee, because each had only one particular case referred to it; but we must see what has been the conduct of the Lord Chancellor as shown by the evidence in both cases, and we must ask, whether that conduct has been such as to satisfy the country, and to show that he ought to be continued in his high office? or, whether, on the other hand, it does not demonstrate his unfitness for that office—not, as I have already said, on the ground that he is guilty of personal corruption—but because of his supineness and carelessness in not preventing the corruption which was going on around and below him?

Sir, the Motion of which I have given notice contains three propositions—first, that the evidence taken before the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court discloses that a great facility exists for obtaining public appointments by corrupt means; second, that such evidence and also that taken before the House of Lords, in the case of Leonard Edmunds, show a laxity of practice and want of caution on the part of the Lord Chancellor in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to public officers over whose head grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices. The third proposition in my Motion is the corollary of the two preceding—namely, that such laxity and want of caution, even in the absence of any improper motive, are, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the high offices of State. I propose to follow up these three propositions in the order which they occupy on the paper. First, with respect to the facility which exists for obtaining public employment, I wish the House to notice that Mr. Welch, a gentle- on the Northern Circuit, being desirous to obtain a public appointment, lays out his money in what he considers a judicious manner for that purpose, and he finds Mr. Richard Bethell, the Chancellor's son, willing to receive a sum of money, and to give Mr. Welch his good offices and mention his name to his father. In due course of time Mr. Welch received an appointment from the Lord Chancellor under circumstances which I may describe as at least very peculiar. I should like to call the attention of the House to the evidence of Mr. Welch, showing that the motive which induced him to give a sum of money to Mr. Richard Bethell was to obtain the latter's interest with the Lord Chancellor. The following evidence was given by Mr. Welch in answer to questions put by the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Bovill), who was appointed a Member of the Committee for the purpose of examining witnesses, but not of voting:—

> "When was it that you first applied to him?—I should think I asked Mr. Bethell in 1862 or 1863; I forget which. Did you apply to him again in 1864?—I did. What time in 1864?—When I was ill he used sometimes to come and ask how I was; that was in January and February. When I found myself getting better, or shortly after that, I mentioned it to him; I said I should be glad if he could exercise any influence, if he would be kind enough to do it. What did he say?—He said he was not then as he used to be, in office—that is, near his father; but he certainly would if he could, if he had an opportunity. And I may mention to you that I have often assisted Mr. Bethell, and others, too, including Members of your honourable House, frequently."

In answer to a question from the hon. Member for Macclesfield (Mr. E. Egerton) who asked whether the assistance was pecuniary assistance? the witness replied—

> "Yes, as friends; and one noble Lord now owes me £8,000 and odd. We settled accounts some time ago; he is a connection of Lord Palmerston. I asked him to help me, and I believe he would do it for me if he could."

I am happy to say, for the sake of the noble Lord, that it does not appear that the person was able to perform the service desired. Mr. Welch went on to say—

> "I have assisted many friends from time to time, perhaps incautiously, it may be foolishly; and, among the rest, I have assisted Members of the House of Commons; two, I know I have assisted, and I have lost nothing by them."

[*A laugh.*] This may be considered a laughing matter by some hon. Members, but I think the country will regard it as a serious matter. In days gone by such things may have been heard of, but I was only aware, by the disclosure before this Committee, that such things were possible now. Mr. Welch seems to have considered that if he found a needy man, who knew a Minister having appointments to give away, and lent him money, the money was well laid out. Was Mr. Welch wrong? With respect to the money he lent Mr. Richard Bethell, he says—

> "Mr. Richard Bethell owes me £1,050. He owes me that now; in the first instance it was £500 that I lent him. Mr. Bovill: Now, will you tell me when he had £500 from you?—I tell you in April or May. Colonel Pennant: In April or May of what year?—Of 1864. Mr. Bovill: Will you be good enough to explain how it was that he had £500 from you in April or May, 1864?—He asked me to lend it to him, and I thought at that time, as he was in no difficulties, that he was a very good object; I thought he was a very good mark, and I further thought that it was very likely if I wanted a compliment, and asked him for it, he might exert himself, as well as others, to assist me. Mr. Vivian: What do you mean by a 'compliment?'—If I wanted any assistance with parties in power. Colonel Pennant: What do you mean by saying that 'he was a very good mark?'—I thought he was ample security for £500 at that time."

The examination was afterwards thus continued—

> "What induced you to lend Mr. Bethell, for the first time, £500?—I thought that he, as other people to whom I had lent money, might exert himself for me if I wanted him to assist me in obtaining an appointment or anything like that. I knew very well he had no appointment himself to give; all he could do was to use influence."

Well, was Mr. Welch wrong in his calculation? In 1863, he had received Mr. Richard Bethell's recommendation to his father, and in April, 1864, Mr. Richard Bethell was in communication with the Lord Chancellor about the Leeds Bankruptcy Court. It appears from a letter read by Mr. Miller, and which the Committee, I am sorry to find, did not require should be delivered up to them, Mr. Welch applied a second time to Mr. Bethell. Now, I want to know whether at that time Mr. Bethell was in communication with the Lord Chancellor? If we turn to Mr. Bethell's evidence we find it in the following statement:—

> "The Lord Chancellor knew that both myself and my wife were exceedingly intimate with Mr. Baron and Lady Mary Wilde; and one day, in his private room, the Lord Chancellor told me that

he was grieved to hear that very serious charges were being made against Mr. Wilde, and he felt that unless Mr. Wilde was able to give a satisfactory answer to those charges he should be compelled to dismiss him. He asked the Lord Chancellor, as a favour, to let him know what the charges were at that time. What he told me was that Mr. Wilde confessed he had borrowed some money from some of the officials of the Court, and that there were some charges about his having unduly passed some official assignees' accounts to whom he was in debt. In about a fortnight after that time my own misfortune came upon me; and I never saw the Lord Chancellor subsequently to that period."

That fixed the time when Mr. Richard Bethell was in intimate communication with the Lord Chancellor; for you will find that what Mr. Richard Bethell called "his own trouble" was his having to resign his own office in London as Registrar in Bankruptcy; and it appears that, on the 14th of May, the Lord Chancellor wrote to Mr. Miller, stating that it was absolutely necessary that his son should resign. But how was the arrangement with Mr. Welch affected? There is a good deal of discrepancy in the evidence upon the subject. Mr. Welch himself says, he sent a cheque direct to Mr. Bethell; but the Rev. Mr. Harding says, that he was the go-between, that the cheque was handed to him, and that he conveyed it to Mr. Bethell. However that may be, it is clear upon the evidence that a cheque of £500 was given in favour of the hon. Richard Bethell, as expressed on the cheque in exchange for a Bill. The Rev. Mr. Harding, in his evidence, says—

"I carried the £500—worse luck!" And he continues as follows:—"I mentioned the arrangement to Mr. Welch, certainly, for this reason, that it was important as regards the understanding that if Mr. Welch got the situation the bill should be destroyed. Decidedly I mentioned it, for I thought it was in Mr. Richard Bethell's favour that it should be understood that the bill should be destroyed."

That is to say, that the bill was to be destroyed, if Mr. Welch got the appointment. Well, let us follow up the story. Mr. Welch got the appointment. There has been great mystery as to what became of that bill; but at last Mr. Welch was driven to admit that it was destroyed without any security being given by Mr. Bethell for the £500. Mr. Bethell had subsequent advances from Mr. Welch of a considerable sum of money. I can give the House the dates. The first cheque of £500 was dated the 6th of May; but that was not the real day, because the cheque appears to have been post-dated. I wish to call the particular attention of the House to these dates in connection with what came out in the Committee of the House of Lords in regard to Mr. Edmunds' case. In August, 1864, a correspondence took place between the Lord Chancellor and other Law Lords about Mr. Edmunds' defalcations, and during that month it became perfectly clear—as from a perusal of the correspondence it will be seen that it must have been perfectly clear—to all who were cognizant of these transactions that Mr. Edmunds would be obliged to resign his offices. On September 10th, after this, the House will perceive that Mr. Welch lends Mr. Bethell another £200. Well, things go on in the Patent Office and in the other House of Parliament, and on the 4th of February it appears that Mr. Leonard Edmunds signed a memorandum promising to resign. Three days after this, I suppose, Mr. Bethell got a hint of this, and informed Mr. Welch of it, for three days after it Mr. Welch finds himself in a position to lend Mr. Bethell another £50. On the 14th of February the Lord Chancellor presents a petition from Mr. Edmunds for a retiring pension, which is granted. On the 15th of February Mr. Slingsby Bethell is appointed Reading Clerk of the House of Lords, and on the 20th he takes his seat in that capacity. By so taking his seat he vacated the office of a Registrar in Bankruptcy in London, and thus the office of Registrar of Bankruptcy in London became an appointment at the disposal of the Lord Chancellor. Mr. Welch thinks £300 will be well laid out, and he gives it to Mr. Richard Bethell. On the 15th of February, the day on which Mr. Slingsby Bethell vacates the office of Registrar, Mr. Welch advances another £300 to Mr. Richard Bethell. There is a letter from Mr. Richard Bethell to Mr. Welch, given in Appendix No. 3 of the Blue-book. The bill for the £500 had been destroyed, it appears, when this letter of acknowledgment was sent to Mr. Welch, but there is a great mystery as to when that letter was sent. There is no date attached to that letter, but it would seem to have been written some considerable time after the £500 and the subsequent advances had been obtained. It is as follows:—

"My dear Welch,—I have not replied to your former letters because I am really annoyed at your troubling me in the way you do. Nobody knows better than you do my present circumstances, how impossible for me it is to make any repayments, as I do not know from one day to another what course my creditors may take. I am sorry that the opposition to the Bill is such a costly affair, but I cannot assist you; there can be no possible dispute between us as to the amount of liability; but, to relieve your mind (which is much more punctilious than it used to be), I owe you £1,050 money advanced, and some day or other I will either pay it, or, at all events, give you some sort of security; but, at present, I do expect you not to bother me. I assure you I am harassed to death."

Now, it is a remarkable thing that, while the capital sum of £1,050 is here stated, there is no mention whatever made as to any sum being due in respect of interest. I think there are good grounds for supposing that that letter was written with a view to enable something to be produced if there should be a trial, but the writer forgot altogether to mention the subject of interest; and if this had been a *bonâ fide* debt due from Mr. Richard Bethell to Mr. Welch, the letter of acknowledgment must have contained some reference to sums due for interest. Well, Sir, we have got to this, that at the end of April or the beginning of May, 1864, £500 is advanced by Mr. Welch to Mr. Bethell, for a purpose which Mr. Welch admitted. On July 26 comes up the question of Mr. Wilde's retirement from the Bankruptcy Court at Leeds. The Committee have given an account of how these circumstances arose. They say—

"In the beginning of 1864, in the course of a general examination which had been instituted as to the Court of Bankruptcy by the Lord Chancellor, an inquiry took place into the alleged misconduct of some of the officers of the Leeds District Court—namely, the two Registrars, Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde, two official assignees, and two messengers."

Charges were brought against Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde, and a letter was sent to Mr. Wilde by Mr. Miller, the Chief Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy. I will not read the whole of the letter, but it said that the charges against Mr. Wilde were—

"1. That accounts which ought to have been submitted to and allowed by your Commissioner were certified by you as having been submitted to and sanctioned by him, without his having ever seen such accounts; and that thereby large sums had been improperly allowed to the official assignees; 2. That you have been in the habit of taxing the bills of the messengers, without calling for the production of the vouchers for the sums alleged to have been paid by them; and, 3. That you have borrowed money both from the official assignees and messengers of the Court, and thereby destroyed your independence and efficiency."

It seems that no explanation in reply to these charges was given for some time; and, on the 24th of May, Mr. Miller wrote to Mr. Wilde as follows:—

"Court of Bankruptcy, May 24, 1864.

"Dear Sir,—I am directed by the Lord Chancellor to request that you will, within one week from this day, put Mr. Commissioner Ayrton in possession of the explanation called for by my letter of the 16th instant, otherwise you will be served with notice to appear and show cause in open court why you should not be dismissed from your office of registrar.—Yours, &c.,

(Signed) "JOHN F. MILLER.

"H. S. Wilde, Esq."

On the 30th of May, in answer to Mr. Miller's letter, Mr. Wilde sent a communication to the Lord Chancellor, who sent it, according to his custom, to Mr. Miller. On the 26th of July, 1864, there is a letter which has been considerably discussed, both in the Committee and by the public, from Mr. Miller, the Chief Registrar in London, to Mr. Wilde. It is couched in these extraordinary terms—

"Court of Bankruptcy, July 26, 1864.

"Sir,—It grieves me much to inform you that, unless I hear, in course of post, that you mean to apply to be allowed to retire, I have instructions from the Lord Chancellor to serve you with notice to appear before him publicly in open court, and show cause why you should not be dismissed from your office of Registrar."

Before I go on further with this letter I would refer to the words "retire," "allowed to retire," because it came out in the evidence of Mr. Wilde that the word "retire," in the Bankruptcy Court means retiring on a pension, but that the word "resign" means resigning unconditionally; and therefore Mr. Miller, in the first part of his letter, says that Mr. Wilde must apply to be allowed to retire—that is, upon a pension, or else appear in open court and show cause why he should not be dismissed from his office. Then comes the second part of his letter. Mr. Miller states that the first paragraph was written in strict obedience to the orders of the Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Chancellor doubts whether he used the word "retire" or "resign." The second paragraph of Mr. Miller's letter, the Lord Chancellor says, was not written by his direction; and Mr. Miller does not impute it to his Lordship, but asserts that it was dictated by his own kindness of feeling towards Mr. Wilde. This is its language—

"It is said that your state of health is such that you can have no difficulty in obtaining such a medical certificate as would entitle you to retire under the 33rd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861; and, if this be so, I sincerely trust, for your own sake, that you will see the propriety of relieving the Chancellor from the very disagreeable and, indeed, painful duty which is thrust upon him."

Here, then, is the letter from the Chief Registrar in Bankruptcy, the official Secretary to the Lord Chancellor, calling upon a man to appear in open court to show cause why he should not be dismissed from the office of Registrar, and suggesting in the next paragraph that he should apply for a medical certificate and retire on the ground of his health. I think the natural construction of that letter is, that the interests of the public were not so much sought after by the writer as the creation of a vacancy in the office. I should like to call the attention of the House to the view that was taken of the letter when it was received at Leeds. It appears that when it reached Mr. Wilde he was exceedingly alarmed, and went and consulted a friend of his, Mr. Bond, who was called before the Committee. Mr. Bond states—

"Mr. Wilde showed me a letter from Mr. Miller, dated the day next but one before, if I recollect right, the 26th of July, and I read it at his request; he said it had frightened him a good deal, or that it had 'put him a good deal out of the way,' I think was his expression. He asked me to give him my opinion about it. I hesitated a moment, as it came upon me unawares, and I told him I thought the better way would be for him to go to London and consult his relative, Sir James Wilde. I think I said, 'I do not think you have much to consult him about; it seems to me it is a foregone conclusion. They do not mean to give you an alternative—they want your place—perhaps you will be better off with your pension, if they will give it you,' or something of that sort. I did not think that I should be asked about this, therefore I am speaking from the merest recollection. I then, I think, asked him, having looked at the letter again, or the latter part of it, 'Well, have you had any medical advice?' 'Have you had any occasion for medical advice?' or something of that sort; and he said 'Yes.' And he added that Mr. Hey had attended him for some affection, I am not quite sure whether of the eye or eyes, but something affecting his vision; he said rather abruptly, 'Do you know him?' I said 'Yes, he lives opposite,' pointing out of the window; he said, 'It has upset me,' or something of that sort, 'will you go across and see him, and see whether he can give me a certificate?' I did go, and I got the certificate which is in the Return. Mr. Hey made some observation, I think to the effect, 'That is as much as I can do for you,' and I jocularly said in answer, 'I daresay it will do; half a certificate will be enough on this occasion.' I might be wrong; I drew my conclusions in a moment, because I had not the least doubt what was meant; it was all done in a few minutes, because Mr. Wilde had to go, I think, by the 10 o'clock train to London."

Well now, Sir, a more extraordinary certificate I should think never was submitted to a public functionary in order to procure a retiring pension. It is dated "Leeds, July 28, 1864," and is in these words—

"I hereby certify that I have been consulted by Mr. Henry S. Wilde, on account of a failure in his sight, which was a serious hindrance to him in the performance of the duties of his office." It does not say, "which I consider is a serious hindrance to him." "Mr. Wilde first consulted me in August, 1863. At his age I cannot look for any improvement in his vision. (Signed) Samuel Hey, F.R.C.S."

It was necessary, I do not know whether by the provisions of the Act of Parliament or by the rules framed by the Lord Chancellor, that the gentleman seeking a retiring pension had to send a petition and make an affidavit as to the facts stated in his petition. And here comes a curious disclosure. It became a question before the Committee by whom and when the petition and affidavit were prepared. Mr. Wilde's account is this—that they came to him cut and dry. He says—

"The note is this—'I have your note and medical certificate, and if you will sign the enclosed petition, and swear to it before any Commissioner for taking affidavits, and send it to my house, 26, St. Stephen's Square, this evening, I will endeavour to get the Lord Chancellor to make the order to-morrow morning;' is that the letter which accompanied the petition?—That was the letter that accompanied the petition. Up to the time of receiving that letter, had you seen Mr. Miller at all upon the subject of this letter of his of the 26th of July, which called upon you to retire?—No; I saw Mr. Miller on the 30th, and I went to him in order, as far as I could be enabled to do so, to get an explanation, and I said to him, 'Mr. Miller, to what am I to attribute this unprecedented severity at the hands of the Lord Chancellor?' He said to me, 'It is on account of your carelessly taxing the messengers' bills.' When you received the petition, was it in the form or not in which you signed it? You will find it set out in pages 26 and 27.—Yes; it was in the form set out; it was engrossed. It came to you ready for signature?—Yes. Had you anything to do with putting in the grounds upon which you were desirous of retiring, as stated in that petition?—No. Now, as regards the affidavit: Who prepared that affidavit, do you know?—That was prepared also in the office of the Chief Registrar, Mr. Miller. And was sent to you with the petition ready engrossed?—Yes, ready engrossed."

So that, to make it perfectly certain that this petition should be presented, the Chief Registrar of Bankruptcy, Mr. Miller, actually prepared the petition setting forth the grounds on which he was to receive the pension, together with the affidavit which he was to swear to. Mr. Miller appeared to think this was rather an extraordinary proceeding, and was not likely to do him any credit, and in his first account he positively denied that the fact was so—

"Had you anything to do with the preparation of the affidavit ?—Nothing whatever. And nothing to do with the petition, except sending a form ?—I do not say that I sent a form: it is very possible that I may have sent a form. If I was asked for a form I sent it. But you certainly had nothing to do with the preparation of the affidavit ?—Certainly not; the affidavit, you know, is a mere few words, it is merely three lines."

Now, if you will turn to 286, you will find Mr. Miller states it thus—

"Did you prepare the petition or not ?—Having seen this, I have no doubt of it. That you prepared it ?—No doubt; I have the petition here, I think. Will you look at it ?—Yes, I have referred to it; here is the petition (producing a paper). It seems to have been prepared in blank, leaving a blank for the important portion of it, 'That your petitioner has for some time past been afflicted with a failure in his sight, and that the same has now become so serious that he is no longer able satisfactorily to perform the duties of his office;' all that has been manifestly left in blank, and filled in from the information of some of those gentlemen, or from written information. Did you prepare the petition or not ?—Having seen this note, I have no doubt that it was prepared in my office. Did you prepare it yourself ? —It is very possible; very likely I did. Having seen that letter, have you any doubt that you did ? —I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I think it exceedingly probable that this was done by me."

Here is another curious thing. Mr. Miller's letter and the certificate are dated the 28th of July—

"But your letter is dated the 28th of July, and the certificate is dated Leeds, July 28 ?—Yes. You, writing from London on the 28th, say that you have received the medical certificate, and yet the medical certificate is dated 'Leeds' the same day ?—That seems odd; it is very incomprehensible."

I think the House will agree with me that there has been a great deal of *hocus pocus* about this certificate; and the result in my mind is this, that, though Mr. Miller is not proved to have been corrupted by either Mr. Richard Bethell or by Mr. Welch, he was a party to the conspiracy to get Mr. Wilde out of the office then. I do not say there was a conspiracy to get Mr. Wilde out of the office originally, because I think that the Lord Chancellor was right in calling on him to show cause in open court why he should not be dismissed from the office of registrar; but I say that Mr. Miller was a party to the conspiracy to get Mr. Wilde out of the office at this particular time; and I think that the evidence I have read sustains that view.

Then we come to that part of the case which more immediately affects the Lord Chancellor. In order that Mr. Wilde should obtain a retiring pension it was necessary that the Lord Chancellor should sign an order to that effect. There is contradictory testimony as between the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Miller on this point. I have read the certificate to the House, and I think the House will agree that it is one which Mr. Bond was justified in calling only half a certificate. Mr. Miller was asked, whether he submitted it to the Lord Chancellor—

"Will you be kind enough to tell us what passed between you and the Lord Chancellor upon the subject ? —I have already told you what passed. I pointed out to the Lord Chancellor what occurred to me on the certificate. I told him I was dissatisfied with the medical certificate, but his Lordship, on reading the petition and the affidavit and the medical certificate, thought that, coupling them together, there was sufficient to justify him in making the order."

Now, what does the Lord Chancellor himself say upon the point ?—

"Mr. Miller has told us (I cannot find the particular answer at this moment) that he considered the certificate unsatisfactory. And then, at question 317, he is asked this question, 'You told us just now that you considered the medical certificate unsatisfactory ?—I did. Considering the medical certificate unsatisfactory, did you prepare a petition which the Lord Chancellor was to act upon, and send it to Mr. Wilde without any communication with the Lord Chancellor ?—I dealt with the matter before me, and I guarded myself in this way, that when I presented the certificate, the affidavit, and the petition to the Lord Chancellor, I pointed out the objections I saw ?'—I have no recollection of any such thing. The petition, affidavit, and certificate were presented to me, and I ought in strictness to have read them all; I do not think that I did. I probably looked at the petition and saw the allegation, and I may have assumed that the medical certificate was in conformity with it; I certainly could never have read the medical certificate, or I should not have allowed it to have passed upon that certificate."

Then, the next question is very much to the same effect, and the answer is this—

"I have no recollection of that. It is very difficult for me to take upon myself to say that that is incorrect, seeing the number of things that pass through my mind; but my strong impression is that I had no observation made to me about the certificate, because I never could have approved the certificate if I had seen it and weighed it deliberately."

Now, I believe that the Lord Chancellor's version is the correct one, and not Mr. Miller's. I believe it is utterly impossible that the attention of the Lord Chancellor could have been called to that certificate before he made the order for the retiring pension. But what I want to know is, why did not the Lord Chancellor read the certificate and the affidavit ? If this were an ordinary case of a man applying for a retiring pension after a number of years' service, we could easily understand that in the pressure of business, from the number of matters which must come before the Lord Chancellor every day and at all hours of the day, he might have neglected his duty and his conduct be excused. But here was a man whom he had directed his Registrar to call before him and show cause in open court why he should not be dismissed from his office. The letter calling upon him to resign was dated July 26; and on the 30th—only four days later—he signed the order for his pension without, by his own confession, having read the affidavit. Now, Sir, I ask the House am I too severe in my language when I say there was "laxity of practice" on the part of the Lord Chancellor in this matter? I want to know, why was Mr. Wilde to be dismissed? The charges against him were—

> "That accounts which ought to have been submitted to and allowed by the Commissioner, were certified as having been submitted to and sanctioned by him, without his having ever seen such accounts; and that thereby large sums had been improperly allowed to the official assignees. That he had been in the habit of taxing the bills of the messengers, without calling for the production of the vouchers for the sums alleged to have been paid by them."

What does the Lord Chancellor do? This is the order signed by the Lord Chancellor—

> "Whereas, the above-named Henry Sedgwick Wilde hath preferred his petition to me, stating, that he had for some time past been afflicted with a failure in his sight, and that the same had become so serious that he is no longer able satisfactorily to perform the duties of his office, and praying that he may be permitted to retire, and that I should be pleased to award him such an annuity aforesaid. Now, upon reading the said petition and the affidavit made in support thereof, and the medical certificate therein referred to, and by virtue of the 33rd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, &c., I do order that henceforth an annuity of £666 13*s.* 4*d.*, being a sum not exceeding two-thirds of his said salary, be paid to the said Henry Sedgwick Wilde for the term of his life out of the said Chief Registrar's account."

That order is signed by the Lord Chancellor. Now, I ask the House, if Mr. Wilde, a subordinate officer of the Court of Chancery, is to be dismissed from his office because he certified accounts as having been submitted to the Commissioner which had not been submitted to him, or seen by him, whereby large sums of money had been improperly allowed to the official assignees? What is to be done to the Lord Chancellor, who says that he has read the certificates and made an order whereby a large sum of money is chargeable to the public, when, in point of fact, he had not read the certificates and the whole preamble of the order, as far as his own personal acts are concerned, is untrue? Are we to mete out a different measure of justice to Mr. Wilde, the Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and to the Lord High Chancellor of England? Would that be satisfactory to the House or to the public? I said there was a determination on the part of Mr. Miller to get Mr. Wilde out at that particular time, and he did get him out. Upon the same day that Mr. Wilde walked out at one door Mr. Welch entered at another. Now, under the peculiar circumstances, was there not haste and want of caution? The Lord Chancellor says that Mr. Miller told him it was important to appoint another registrar immediately. Had he no reason for supposing that Mr. Miller was acting in the interest of his son? On the 15th of May, after the Lord Chancellor had determined that his son should be removed, who is it who interferes and begs for delay? Mr. Miller. Who is it that addresses repeated remonstrances, that makes long written statements, that makes personal intercession for re-consideration of that determination? Is it not Mr. Miller? To a person of ordinary intelligence, knowing that Mr. Miller had been in his son's interest, the very fact of Mr. Miller recommending haste in the filling up of this appointment should have raised suspicion. Well, who was Mr. Welch, who was substituted for Mr. Wilde? How is that mentioned by the Lord Chancellor? Mr. Richard Bethell, in his evidence, tells us, at Question 2,357—

> "Did Mr. Welch make any request to you to use your influence with the Lord Chancellor to obtain for him an appointment?—In 1862 I think it was; I must tell you that though I saw Mr. Welch constantly at Richmond some years ago, yet when I was acting in 1861 as principal secretary to the Lord Chancellor I saw very little of him. I was too much occupied; but soon after I obtained the appointment of registrar in Quality Court, Mr. Welch called upon me one day, and asked me to put him in the way of making the strongest application he could to the Lord Chancellor for preferment. Of course we discussed the sort of appointment he wanted; he was anxious to obtain a County Court Judgeship. I told him I thought there was no chance of getting that, for I knew that the Lord Chancellor had made two or three promises, but I thought there was a better chance of his obtaining a registrarship in bankruptcy. He then consulted with me as to the names of the persons from whom he could get testimonials, and he assured me that Sir William Atherton, then Attorney General, and several leading men on the Northern Circuit, would write the strongest letters possible on his behalf. I told

him that if he would get those testimonials, I had no objection at all to tell the Lord Chancellor that he was a personal friend of mine, and that I would bring his name prominently forward whenever a vacancy occurred, as one of the candidates for the office. This was done, I believe. I remember in 1863 mentioning that matter to the Lord Chancellor. The Lord Chancellor told me to tell him that there were so many candidates before him, that he was very much afraid there was very little chance indeed of his being able, during his tenure of office, to do anything for him."

When this vacancy occurred, on the retirement of Mr. Wilde, the Lord Chancellor was told by Mr. Miller that haste was necessary in filling up the appointment; but it appears, from the evidence of Richard Bethell, that the Lord Chancellor in 1863, a year before, had had Mr. Welch brought before him as a candidate for appointment, when he had said that he feared, because there were so many candidates before him, he should be unable to do anything for him. Then why was Mr. Welch selected out of all those candidates? The Lord Chancellor said that he went upon his recollection of the high testimonials which that gentleman had produced. I am bound to admit that the testimonials of Mr. Welch are satisfactory, and I raise no question upon that point. A great deal has been said about a testimonial from Sir William Atherton, but, as a testimonial, it is not worth the paper on which it is written. Sir William Atherton was a very cautious man, and I think, when the letter was submitted to the Lord Chancellor, it did not go very far as a recommendation of Mr. Welch. Sir William Atherton writes in the way in which members of the same circuit write of and to each other—

"Dear Welch,—Your note has reached me today. You are still at liberty to refer to me, but that is all I am in a condition to say. I could not write such a letter of introduction as you mention. "Yours faithfully,
"WILLIAM ATHERTON."

I do not think much of a testimonial such as that. But I admit that this gentleman has other testimonials which are satisfactory. Mr. Edward James wrote to say that "in any office which may be bestowed upon you, you would do justice." Mr. Udall says, "You are particularly qualified for a legal appointment." Mr. Temple considers him a "gentleman of honour and well qualified for an appointment requiring industry and activity." Mr. Manisty also considers "that you are well qualified for any appointment." I say, unhesitatingly, that those certificates would, under ordinary circumstances, have justified the Lord Chancellor in appointing Mr. Welch. There is nothing special in them; they are certificates which fifty out of sixty men on the Northern Circuit could obtain. I believe very few men on circuit but what are called "black sheep" would find any difficulty in obtaining such certificates. They are sufficient to justify the appointment of Mr. Welch but for one circumstance—Mr. Welch had been recommended to the Lord Chancellor by Richard Bethell. It cannot be said that the Lord Chancellor could have forgotten the circumstances under which his son had mentioned that gentleman's name, because they were very peculiar. Mr. Richard Bethell tells us at Question 2,365—

"When you had a conversation with the Lord Chancellor upon the subject of Mr. Wilde did you on that occasion mention the name of Mr. Welch?—No, certainly not; I never mentioned his name to the Lord Chancellor except in an incidental manner. It is a very curious thing which recalls it to my recollection, and I may as well state it to the Committee. Mr. Welch had an estate for sale in Suffolk, which he had acquired in right of his wife; and he was exceedingly anxious that I should induce the Lord Chancellor to purchase this estate. The Lord Chancellor was at that time desirous of having a manor in Suffolk; he is very fond of shooting, and I thought that this estate might suit him. Mr. Welch sent me drawings and plans of the estate, and I remember showing them to the Lord Chancellor, and his asking me to whom the estate belonged, and to get him all the particulars about it. I said, 'The estate belongs to a gentleman at the bar, who is a candidate for office before you.' He said, 'What is he a candidate for?' I said, 'He wants to be a registrar in bankruptcy.' The Lord Chancellor then made this observation, 'Poor fellow, tell him I am afraid there is very little chance for him.'"

Is it possible that such a recommendation by Mr. Richard Bethell could have escaped his Lordship's memory? And when the Lord Chancellor remembered that Mr. Welch had been originally recommended to him by his son, the fact should have made him pause and hesitate, however high the testimonials. I do not mean to say that he must have known that any corrupt means had been employed to obtain those recommendations, but he should have searched and investigated the matter thoroughly before appointing Mr. Welch. Question 460 is thus answered by Mr. Miller—

"Had he been a registrar before then?—Yes, Mr. Richard Bethell was appointed registrar in March, 1862, and he resigned in May, 1864. On the 14th of May, 1864, I received from the Lord Chancellor a letter which, if the Committee desire it, I will read. This is the Lord Chancellor's original letter; it directs me to prepare an order for Mr. Bethell's instant removal—

"'Saturday, May 14, 1864.

"'Sir,—It has just come to my knowledge in the most sudden and overwhelming manner, that my eldest son, Mr. Bethell, has been guilty of the most flagrant misconduct. He is stated to me (and the fact admits of no doubt) to have lost during the last twelvemonth very large sums of money by betting at races, and to have raised money to pay these debts by bills of exchange and loans in every quarter.' [I call particular attention to these words.] 'He is also stated to have been for some time in the habit of neglecting personal attendance at his office, and to have had his official duties discharged by deputy. I feel it my duty instantly to remove him from his office. I beg you to prepare an order without a moment's delay, stating 'it has been proved to my satisfaction that Mr. Richard Augustus Bethell has neglected the duties of his office, and is unfit to be continued therein,' and that I therefore remove him from the office of one of the registrars of the court as from this day. It would be idle to speak to you of the state of mind I am in; but I am determined that he shall be instantly removed, and that in the manner which justice requires.

"'Your faithful servant, WESTBURY.

"'To the Chief Registrar.'"

"Well," says Mr. Miller, "that is an insufficient reason which was assigned by the Lord Chancellor for the removal of his son. He had been losing money at races, and had been raising money by bills. It is not a course to be approved of, but it is not a reason for dismissing an official." What is the Lord Chancellor's answer to that? His answer to that was that "it was due to the public that his son should resign." From that letter he does not appear to have gone into particulars with Mr. Miller, but I gather from it that Mr. Miller must have known that there was good cause for dismissing Mr. Bethell. With regard to the expression, "It has come to my knowledge in a sudden and overwhelming manner," I should wish to refer to another part of the evidence—that of Mr. Skirrow, whose name I shall have to mention again. At Question 2,672 a letter from the Lord Chancellor to Mr. Skirrow is read, in which he says of his son —

"I am sure he must be indebted to you; I will repay you. But do not lend any more money to him, for it is a direct encouragement to evil. If his wife and six little children, affection for his father and brothers and sisters, and regard for his own character and position, have not been sufficient to keep him from plunging a fourth time into these mad and evil courses, nothing will."

On this I may remark that if running into evil courses three times did not prevent the Lord Chancellor originally appointing this son to the office of Registrar in Bankruptcy in 1862, why should a fourth time make it necessary to remove him? The inference I draw from that is that there was some important fact present to the Lord Chancellor's mind with regard to his son which is, perhaps, covered by the words I have read—"raising money and loans in every quarter"—which induced the Lord Chancellor to think that it was due to the public that his son should resign his office. If that were the case—if he were awake to the proceedings of his son when the name of Mr. Welch was submitted to him—he ought to have recollected that his son had used his good offices on behalf of Mr. Welch; he ought to have searched more anxiously to discover if his son had had any corrupt dealing with Mr. Welch. I do not impute to the Lord Chancellor more than this—I do not believe that he had any knowledge that there was a corrupt bargain; but the circumstances were so suspicious that it was his bounden duty not to have put that name into the blank in the appointment until a searching inquiry had taken place. But what is Richard Bethell's own version of his reason for resigning? At Question 2,345 he says—

"Mr. Skirrow," (who seems to have been a trustee of his marriage settlement and a great friend of his wife,) "came to me and said, 'Do pray, Richard, resign. The Lord Chancellor is in such a state of indignation that I cannot tell what he may do; he does threaten to dismiss you,' though," (adds Mr. Bethell) "there was no case for dismissal."

At 2,335 he says—

"My reason for tendering my resignation was, that I felt I was in too embarrassed a position to remain in this country unless some arrangement could be made."

And he goes on—

"My own private reason for tendering my resignation was that the Lord Chancellor had made me acquainted with the proceedings which were pending against Mr. Wilde, and I felt in my own mind that I could not, with any justice, ask him to extend any favour to me or treat me in any manner different from that in which I knew he was going to treat Mr. Wilde."

That seems a romantic sentiment coming from a man who was so involved that he had to leave his office and go abroad to avoid his creditors, and whose debts were said to be something between £20,000 and £25,000; but it seems to me there is falsehood on the face of it. I have now nearly done with the case of Mr. Wilde's retirement and Mr. Welch's appointment. What I impute to the Lord Chancellor was that he was guilty of culpable negligence, that he did not read the certificate, and that he did not make a searching inquiry before he put Mr. Welch into Mr. Wilde's place, remembering the connection of the name with his son. I do not believe in my own mind that the Lord Chancellor was aware of any corrupt sale of office. But the circumstances were suspicious—the manner in which Mr. Wilde had been hustled out of the office by Mr. Miller—who he must have known was in his son's interest—was a reason why he should have delayed long before he acted in so hasty and unwise a manner.

We come now to another plot. Mr. Welch being instituted into office at Leeds, and Mr. Richard Bethell having been compelled by his father to resign his Registrarship, it so happened that the case of the Edmunds' defalcations arose. It appears that Mr. Richard Bethell pressed his father to fill the vacancy then created with his own name; but the Lord Chancellor declined, and then it was determined to fill up the vacancy with Slingsby Bethell's name. Mr. Slingsby Bethell was at that time a Registrar in Bankruptcy in London. As that office could not be held simultaneously with the Reading Clerkship of the House of Lords, Mr. Richard Bethell's friends thought that a fine opportunity for getting him a snug berth. Then comes another actor on the stage—Mr. Skirrow—Mr. Skirrow, who, I suppose, knows well what will pass muster with the public and what will not—evidently thought it was too strong a thing to put Richard Bethell into a Registrarship in London; but he thought if some country Registrar were brought to London Mr. Bethell could take the country Registrarship. Anything was good enough for the country. That was the scheme. Mr. Richard Bethell was to be appointed to Leeds, and Mr. Welch was to be transferred to London. But there was the difficulty with the Lord Chancellor to be got over. He was reluctant to appoint his son to any place whatever; and though one may make every allowance for his feelings as a father, his reluctance was certainly well grounded. I must recall the attention of the House to the fact that as soon as Mr. Slingsby Bethell took his seat as Reading Clerk in the House of Lords Mr. Welch lent Mr. Richard Bethell £300 more. That was on the 20th February. On the 18th February Mr. Skirrow had an interview with the Lord Chancellor, of which he gives the following account. He is asked (2,711)—"Had you any communication with Mr. Welch about that time?" And he replies—

"Towards the end of February, about the 17th or 18th, I mentioned that the Lord Chancellor intended, or had made up his mind, to appoint Mr. Slingsby Bethell to the House of Lords, and I saw at once that there would be a vacancy in London among the registrars. I then thought it would be worth while to appeal to the Lord Chancellor again—I was always averse to Mr. Bethell coming to London, because I thought he would be with his friends, and that a country appointment might very properly be given to him, considering the manner in which he had been compelled by his father to resign. Accordingly, on Saturday, the 18th February, I proceeded to Lincoln's Inn, where the Lord Chancellor was sitting. The Lord Chancellor had risen for the day, and when I went in I announced to him what I had come about. The Lord Chancellor was very angry. He said I had taken a very great liberty in pressing upon him any appointment for his son."

On the 22nd, however, the Lord Chancellor sent for Mr. Skirrow to come to his house directly; and this is what Mr. Skirrow says took place at that interview and in consequence of it—

"I therefore pointed out to the Lord Chancellor that it really was impossible she (meaning Mrs. Bethell) could leave the country for three or four months, and I again urged him to re-consider his views about his son. I am ready to admit that I put it to him in the strongest and most affectionate manner, and that the Lord Chancellor did listen to me; but he told me he would do nothing and could do nothing until I had laid before him a statement of the debts, and how they would be compromised and arranged. I did not see much advantage in that, but the Lord Chancellor certainly received me more kindly and he gave me permission, after seeing his son, to talk to him again on the subject; but he never said that he would appoint Richard to any place, and he never authorized me to say so. On the morning of the 22nd, after leaving the Lord Chancellor, I saw Mr. Bethell. Speaking to him, of course, without any reticence, and without any caution (and I am afraid that I did it in a very incautious way), I have no doubt I told Mr. Bethell that I thought his wife's letter had done a great deal of good, and that the Lord Chancellor certainly was more courteous, and I told Mr. Bethell that he must immediately set to work and prepare a list of all the debts, how they were situated, and what could be done with them."

Mr. Richard Bethell was told by Mr. Skirrow that he ought to make an arrangement with his creditors. The reply which I have been quoting is continued in these words—

"I should state, perhaps, which I had forgotten, that at the interview with the Lord Chancellor on the Wednesday morning my view was that the Lord Chancellor should transfer some person to London, and give Mr. Bethell a country appointment, and my mind was very much directed to Bristol, as Mrs. Bethell's family lives in that county. When I saw Mr. Bethell he said he should prefer Leeds, and I think he said he was going on a visit to Leeds, and that he would look about there and see if he could get a house for his wife."

It is quite clear that, in this interview with the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Skirrow pressed on his Lordship the arrangement which Mr. Richard Bethell wished for, and that, while making no distinct promise, the Lord Chancellor said he would consider it. Mr. Skirrow communicated this to Mr. Richard Bethell; and what was his impression of what had taken place between Mr. Skirrow and the Lord Chancellor? In Answer 2,463 he says—

> "I was naturally very unwilling to come back and serve again in the London Court where I had served so recently, and I thought that I would rather go out of London, and live quietly in the country, and I suggested to my wife, as she was going to pay a visit to the Lord Chancellor, that she should endeavour to get him to consent to bring up Mr. Welch from Leeds and allow me to succeed him at Leeds, and that we would live at Harrogate, and that I should be able to go in and out by train and perform my duties."

Again, in a letter to Mr. Miller, he says—

> "I had not time to call on you previous to leaving London, but I suppose you have heard that the Chancellor intends to transfer Mr. Welch from the Leeds district to London, and to appoint me to the district."

It is quite clear, therefore, that the impression left on the minds of both Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Skirrow was that the Lord Chanceller would consider the proposal, and, further, they were so far convinced of their ability to bring him round that they got Mr. Miller to make out two appointments. By whose directions? Mr. Skirrow himself was a creditor of Mr. Richard Bethell. The latter had owed him a large sum of money, and at this particular time he owed him £600. He had, therefore, a direct personal interest in Mr. Richard Bethell's receiving a valuable appointment. Was Mr. Skirrow aware of the advances made by Mr. Welch to Mr. Richard Bethell? Let him speak for himself. The question was twice put to him. In Question 2,687 he was asked—

> "Were you at all aware of Mr. Bethell having any money transaction with Mr. Welch in May, 1864?"

What is his reply?—

> "I should say not; but I heard of so many people who had bills, and so many debts, that I could not positively swear that I never heard the name—but certainly it was never brought prominently before me."

Now, I call that fencing with the question. In Question 2,756 he is again asked—

> "Were you ever aware that Mr. Welch was a creditor of his?"

The answer is remarkable—

> "I saw many people in May, 1864, but it never was prominently brought before me. I had a great many personal interviews with people, but I never saw Mr. Welch."

I leave it to the House to judge from these two answers to a simple question whether Mr. Skirrow was or was not aware of what was passing between Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Welch. Well, while Mr. Skirrow, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Richard Bethell are engaged in this part of the transaction, Mr. Miller, who is not affected by the evidence with any share in that corruption, takes a most extraordinary step. He has two appointments engrossed. By whose directions were those appointments engrossed? Mr. Miller says by Mr. Skirrow's; Mr. Skirrow positively contradicts him. That almost leads to the supposition that the contradiction had been previously arranged. Mr. Miller says he engrossed the appointment by the direction of Mr. Skirrow. The latter says he never gave him such a direction. Be this as it may, Mr. Miller took the extraordinary step of preparing the two engrossments, and submitting them to the Lord Chancellor. He is asked, whether he ever did such a thing before? His answer is, "Once." "In whose favour?" "Mr. Richard Bethell's." When Mr. Slingsby Bethell was appointed to the office of reading clerk in the House of Lords, and vacated his registrarship in the London Court, Mr. Miller thought the Lord Chancellor could be prevailed upon to appoint Mr. Richard Bethell to the latter office, and, without any directions from his Lordship, proceeded to make out the engrossment. Looking at all this, can any one doubt that Mr. Miller was in this plot? No one who reads the evidence carefully can have any doubt of it. On the 22nd Mr. Skirrow left the Lord Chancellor under the impression that he would be prevailed upon to make the arrangement. What is the Lord Chancellor's own account of this matter? In Answer 3,375 he says—

> "But in the month of February of the present year his friends surrounded me, and his wife wrote to me, and I ascertained that there was no reproach attaching to him on the ground that he had neglected his duty; I found that it was a false imputation. I was then entreated to give him some appointment, provided he got a release from all his creditors. What I said upon that occasion was this, that I would make no promise, but that I would consider the matter when the release was obtained."

Taking the Lord Chancellor's own account of the matter, as given in that answer, I do not think Mr. Skirrow and Mr. Richard Bethell were very far wrong in thinking that if the latter gentleman could get a release from his creditors the Lord Chancellor would consider the arrangement, and I do not think Mr. Skirrow very much misrepresented his Lordship's feelings. The noble and learned Lord continues—

> "This was some time, if I recollect rightly, in the month of February in the present year. Information then reached me that there was so little hope of his being weaned from these courses that I found he had pursued the same thing at Paris. I then sent for Mr. Skirrow, and I begged him never to mention the subject to me again, for that I had determined never to appoint him."

He is asked again, Question 3,399—

> "Has your Lordship ever given Mr. Skirrow reason to suppose that you would be willing to appoint Mr. Bethell to Leeds and Mr. Welch to London?"

He replies—

> "Mr. Skirrow was the gentleman who solicited me to appoint my son to an office in the country. Two places, I think, were mentioned to me by him on that occasion; one was, I think, Leeds, and the other, I think, was Bristol. I never told Mr. Skirrow anything more than this—that if my son succeeded in getting released from his creditors I would consider the matter."

The Lord Chancellor expresses himself in these terms on the 22nd of February. On the 24th Mr. Richard Bethell writes to Mr. Miller that the transfer is going to take place; and on the 26th the Lord Chancellor has ultimately made up his mind that he will not make the appointment. In answer 2,724 Mr. Skirrow says—

> "On Sunday morning, the 26th, the Lord Chancellor sent for me. The moment I entered the room he was excessively violent, and he told me that he had deeply regretted that he had sent for me on Wednesday, as I had taken advantage of that interview, and had misrepresented to Richard what had taken place. He was very angry. I repeated to him exactly the conversation which had passed between Mr. Bethell and myself, and which I have stated here, but he positively told me that he would never listen, directly or indirectly, to any application about his son."

I was at a loss to understand this change of mind on the part of the Lord Chancellor between the 22nd and the 26th. It occurred to me that something must have happened between those dates, and I turned to Parliamentary Papers and to the public journals of the time in order to see whether they would throw any light on the matter. I will ask the House to look at the dates connected with the appointment of the Lord Chancellor's son to the post of Reading Clerk to the House of Lords. On the 14th of February the Lord Chancellor presented a petition from Mr. Edmunds, asking to be allowed to retire upon a pension. On the 17th the Lord Chancellor appointed Mr. Slingsby Bethell. On the 20th Mr. Slingsby Bethell took his seat as Reading Clerk in the House of Lords; and it was on the 22nd that Mr. Skirrow endeavoured to induce the Lord Chancellor to appoint his son to the office at Leeds, which the Lord Chancellor said he would consider of. On the 25th, which was Saturday, an article appeared in one of the Saturday papers denouncing the conduct of the Lord Chancellor in filling up the place vacated by Mr. Edmunds with his son, Mr. Slingsby Bethell. Now, I believe that article in the Saturday paper recalled the Lord Chancellor to a sense of his duty. The learned Lord opposite (the Lord Advocate), I see, dissents, but can he explain upon any other supposition the sudden change of mind on the part of the Lord Chancellor? I believe that the Lord Chancellor was actuated on the 22nd by kindly feelings. I believe that Mr. Richard Bethell's wife had appealed to those feelings which we rejoice to see in the Lord Chancellor as a man. His private feelings for the moment overpowered his sense of duty to the public, but I believe that when those remarks appeared in the public papers he very properly overcame those kindly feelings, and deferred to the sense of duty to the public which had actuated him before those influences were brought to bear upon him. I believe this is the history of the sudden change of mind on the part of the Lord Chancellor. I believe that but for those remarks in the public press—and not only in the public press, for the Edmunds scandal was the talk of the whole town—this second job would have been carried out. I believe that Mr. Welch would have been transferred to the Court in London, and Mr. Richard Bethell would have been sent to the Court in Leeds, in accordance with the corrupt bargain made between those two men. I do not impute to the Lord Chancellor any knowledge of the corrupt bargain between Mr. Welch and Mr. Richard Bethell, but when we have said that we have said all we can say for him. I do not think any one can say that he has in these transactions shown that vigilance for the public interests which the public have a right to expect from him. But, I ask, does the evidence show that he was shocked at the notion of having appointed a man to an office who was a creditor of his son? I am satisfied on the evidence that the Lord Chancellor was not aware of it, but the question is put to him (No. 3,370)—

> "Had your Lordship any knowledge that Mr. Welch had lent money to Mr. Bethell before this appointment was made?—Answer. Not the least."

Then the next question is—

> "If your Lordship had been aware of it, would the appointment have been made?—It is difficult to say what I should have done, but I think I should not have appointed him."

Now, I ask the House, was there that high sense of honour in the Lord Chancellor to have listened to the notion that he would appoint a man to an office who had made an advance to his son, and that son having recommended him to his post? I should have thought that if such a question had been put to the Lord High Chancellor of England he would have scouted the notion as an impossibility. I think that one sentence of the Lord Chancellor goes more to condemn him than the whole of the evidence.

I have asked the House to judge, not upon the one case only, but upon the two—the Edmunds' case as well as the other. The Committee of the other House of Parliament have reported, in substance, that Mr. Edmunds, having been guilty of defalcations in the several offices he held, amounting to want of personal integrity, the Lord Chancellor said he would not stand in the way of his retiring upon a pension. He presented a petition to the House of Lords from Mr. Edmunds, asking for a pension, and did not apprise the Committee who took that petition into consideration of what Mr. Edmunds' irregularities had been. In the case of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court the Lord Chancellor himself signed the order for Mr. Wilde's pension after having called upon him to show cause in open court why he should not be dismissed from his office. In the other case, it not being in his province himself to grant the pension, he connived—I do not wish to use a harsh expression—he was privy to, and allowed the Committee to grant that pension, he himself being cognizant of the strongest reasons for not granting it, without informing the Committee of those reasons. The Committee of the House of Lords acquitted the Lord Chancellor of any improper motive. The Committee of the House of Commons acquitted him of everything but haste and want of caution in granting the retiring pension. I say that, putting these cases together, they show a moral obtuseness on the part of the Lord Chancellor which, in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of the House and the country, disqualifies him from discharging those grave duties that belong to his office. Sir, when this retiring pension had been granted under these extraordinary circumstances to Mr. Edmunds—that pension now most righteously rescinded—who was put into the place vacated by Mr. Edmunds? The Lord Chancellor's son. Now, I have not a word to say against Mr. Slingsby Bethell's character. I believe that he is quite a proper person to hold that office. But I say that a man of nice sensibilities would have paused before he filled up with his son a place that had been vacated in such a way. I impute no improper motives to the Lord Chancellor in this case, but I say that it has had a bad effect in the country. It has led people to think that the object to be attained in granting a retiring pension was a vacancy. It has given rise to the suspicion that the object was a vacancy. I do not impute that to the Lord Chancellor, but it has induced people to think so. When these facts come before the public they do not enter into the evidence so nicely as we do here. They do not temper justice with mercy, as we are prepared to do now. When the facts came before them that Mr. Edmunds, a defaulter, was allowed, with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor, to retire from his office, and that the Lord Chancellor's second son was put in his place; that Mr. Wilde was allowed by the Lord Chancellor, upon an insufficient medical certificate, to retire from his office with a pension; and that a gentleman had been appointed to succeed him who had lent to another son £1,050, can we wonder that the public should draw their own conclusions? I acquit the Lord Chancellor of any corrupt motives, either in making the vacancy or in filling up the appointment; but I say that he has given great occasion of scandal in the country. He has led people to think that places can be obtained by corrupt means, and that the Lord Chancellor does not stand too nicely upon reasons for removing one man and putting in another. And I say that this state of things, this want of vigilance, this supineness, this indifference—I might almost say this fatuous simplicity, if such words can be applied to such a man as the Lord Chancellor—I say that the unsuspiciousness that has enabled his subordinates and those around him to practise that corruption which, I admit, he himself is free from, is almost as bad for the country, although not for himself, as if he were personally guilty of this corruption.

I have now concluded my remarks. I hope I have satisfied the House that I have not brought forward this matter on light grounds. I know not whether the majority of this House will affirm the Resolution that I place before them, but I feel satisfied that the country will think that it is a duty we owe to it to pass in review the conduct of the Lord Chancellor. This House will shortly be dissolved. At every hustings and place of election in the country the returning officer, in obedience to an Act which, in our zeal for purity, we have passed, will proclaim the pains and penalties that will accrue to any elector who may be engaged in corrupt proceedings. And I ask, when that is read to the electors, will they not ask—Is the Legislature of this country sincere and earnest? Is it only the corruption of £10 householders, freemen, and liverymen that they are so anxious to punish, or will they punish corruption pervading the functionaries of the highest Court of the kingdom, and unchecked by the highest Judge of the land? I have done my part towards finding an answer to these questions. I now ask the House to consider this question calmly and judicially, as I have endeavoured to do. I ask them to do so without reference to party. I ask them to give to the Resolution which I have the honour to propose such consideration as may satisfy their own consciences and the honour of the country.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the evidence taken before the Committee of this House, on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, discloses that a great facility exists for obtaining Public Appointments by corrupt means; and that such Evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the House of Lords in the case of Leonard Edmunds, and laid before this House, shows a laxity of Practice and want of caution, on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to Public Officers over whose heads grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such Officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices; and that such laxity and want of caution, even in the absence of any improper motive, are, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible, and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the High Offices of State."—(*Mr. Hunt.*)

The LORD ADVOCATE: Sir, I very gladly acknowledge the tone of moderation and temper in which the hon. Gentleman has dealt with this very important subject. It may, perhaps, be not without significance to consider for a moment what the effect of laying the evidence before the House and the public has been—for if we had come to a Resolution on this very grave question some days ago upon the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield), we should, upon the admission of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hunt), have proceeded upon grounds for which there was not a shadow of foundation. Sir, the other day the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Cranbourne) seemed to suggest that I ought not to take any part in this discussion, and that I could not do so without an appearance of partiality. I suppose, because the House did me the honour of putting me on the Committee for the purpose of examining the witnesses, the noble Lord assumed that I could not give my opinion of the case without prejudice. I am surprised at such an objection coming from the noble Lord. I am surprised the noble Lord did not recollect that on a former occasion he occupied an exactly similar position. This House, urged thereto very much by the noble Lord, had driven another very eminent Member of the Government from office, by a vote which I rather think now every Member of this House who voted upon the subject regrets. The noble Lord sat upon the Education Committee of last year; but, notwithstanding, he did not think it unsuitable for him after the Report had been made to the House to take a great, a strong, and a leading part in the discussion of the Report. Therefore I do not think I can be justly accused of entering upon this matter with prejudice. Having had the great advantage of hearing the evidence from day to day, of seeing the witnesses under examination, and of hearing the discussions which took place in Committee, I now offer on behalf of one who if he had been present would have needed no such assistance—on behalf of the Lord Chancellor in his absence, to state to the House the views which occur to me upon the evidence. In the first place, I quite admit that the House should be sensitively jealous of that which is uppermost in the minds of men in connection with this subject—namely, the purity of official administration. But there are other matters also which the House will do well to consider. There has been laid upon the Lord Chancellor a great variety of imputations, some of them not of the most consistent kind. He has been accused of undue leniency one day and of undue severity the next. It has turned out that the original imputation made in this House with regard to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court rests on no foundation whatever. The suggestion was that Mr. Wilde had been called on to resign and had refused, and that Mr. Welch had been appointed to occupy his office until Mr. Bethell's outlawry should be reversed. That, however, has turned out to be quite false. Now we have had certain other imputations made, which have been withdrawn, by the hon. Gentleman who has just resumed his seat. It is all very well to say that those imputations are not now made; but it is well to remember that they have been made, and that it is difficult for the most impartial man to shake himself free from the prejudices which have been raised. I approach the consideration of this question, therefore, with great anxiety, and I ask the House to give that indulgence which a judicial tribunal always gives to statements which are made in behalf of a person against whom grave charges have been made.

Now, this Resolution, or series of Resolutions, seems to me to allege nothing that I quite understand, but to suggest a great deal which it does not express. The Committee chosen, and most properly chosen, from the Members of this House, have given their deliverance in this matter, and I think the hon. Gentleman and the House would have done well to content themselves with the verdict of that Committee. How far the Resolution before the House goes beyond the Report of the Committee I shall not now stop to say; I will come to that afterwards. But I wish to recall to the attention of the House the circumstances under which the retirement of Mr. Wilde and the appointment of Mr. Welch took place. I wish to consider this question under two separate heads. I will inquire, first, into the retirement of Mr. Wilde and the appointment of Mr. Welch in July, 1864; and then into the entirely separate and unconnected proceedings in the month of February, 1865. There appears to be an idea that there was some connection between the two; but they are entirely distinct. What led to the proceedings with respect to Mr. Wilde? The hon. Gentleman opposite seems to think that these proceedings arose from some sort of corrupt bargain between Mr. Welch and Mr. Wilde. [Mr. HUNT: I distinctly disclaimed any such idea.] At all events, the real nature of the transaction was this:—In the year 1864 very great complaints had arisen with regard to the administration of the local Bankruptcy Courts. A Committee was appointed in that year, and has been again appointed this year to inquire into the justice and truth of those complaints. So numerous had the complaints become that in April, 1864, the Lord Chancellor found it necessary to make an inquiry, not alone into the Court at Leeds, but into all the Courts; and he appointed Mr. Ayrton, Commissioner of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and Mr. Harding, an accountant of London, to go over all the Courts to inquire. Mr. Miller was the Chief Registrar, and he was examined before the Bankruptcy Committee on the 3rd of May, 1864. His evidence will be found at page 8 of the Report of that year. Mr. Ayrton's first Report on these proceedings is also now printed. His second Report will be found at page 361. Therefore the Bankruptcy Committee had full cognizance of what was going on. Mr. Harding was examined on the 30th of June 1864, and he gave an account of his proceedings. He stated that he went to Leeds, Birmingham, Newcastle, and Nottingham, and in all these places he found very serious grounds of complaint. With regard to Leeds, he found there were grounds of complaint against both the Registrars, the official assignees, and the messengers, and so reported; and without detaining the House, it will be enough to say that if they look to Mr. Harding's evidence on the 30th of June, 1864, pages 256 and 253, they will find that with respect to Newcastle, Nottingham, and other places, very similar evidence was given. Mr. Miller was asked—

> "In all these cases are the persons charged offered an opportunity of making their defence and giving in their own statement?—Yes, before we conclude any case, we give the examination to the individual to look at, and ask whether he has any observation to make upon it, and whether there are any corrections which, in his opinion, should be made, and he has also an opportunity of sending his remarks to the Lord Chancellor."

I find also, that the complaints with regard to Leeds were very much matters of publicity in July, 1864. In the proposed Report on the 22nd of July, 1864, it is stated—

> "As to the Registrars, these gentlemen appear to hold an anomalous position, occasionally dis-

charging the functions of the Commissioners, and when not so occupied their duties appear to be such as would be better discharged by experienced accountants; their utility under the existing system appears to be of an extremely limited character; as to the control which should be exercised by the Registrars over the messengers of the court, it appears that in one of the district courts, two of the Registrars were actually under pecuniary obligations to the messengers of the court, and had been so for many years. The Registrars are intrusted with the audit and taxation of the messengers' bills of costs against the bankrupt estate, and in the cases referred to, each of the messengers are reputed to have overcharged sums, amounting in one case to £1,423, and in the other to £1,666 in two years, which overcharges had been allowed by the Registrars, and retained by the messengers."

The Lord Chancellor was then engaged in a great, an arduous, and a thankless task—one which was sure to be questioned, and the discharge of which has been questioned. He has found it his duty to reflect upon the conduct of a great number of individuals. There is not one of those individuals or one of their relations who does not feel aggrieved by these proceedings; and the House should take care not to be led by fine-drawn suspicions to weaken the hands of a man who was thus addressing himself in the public interest to a task of great difficulty, who was hampered by obstacles of all kinds, and who was certain, if successful, to bring down upon himself obloquy from the friends of all those against whom he was proceeding. That was the duty upon which the Lord Chancellor was engaged when these affairs began, and we have had laid before the House a Return showing the results which were attained. Here is a list of the sums which have been recovered from official assignees and messengers in the Courts of Bankruptcy, and they amount to over £20,000—money recovered by the Lord Chancellor's direction from persons who had improperly retained it, and against whom he was obliged to use the powers which the Bankruptcy Court gave him. It may be said, how does that bear upon the present inquiry? In this way—that it is utterly absurd to suppose that the Lord Chancellor was only looking for Mr. Wilde's place in instituting these proceedings. The fact is that the Lord Chancellor was dealing with a large question, affecting others as well as Mr. Wilde; and, having sat upon the Bankruptcy Committee, I appeal to every Member of it whether the evils that had to be redressed were not of the most crying character. In regard to the Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, did the Lord Chancellor mark out Mr. Wilde as a victim simply because he wanted his office for somebody else? Let us see what took place, and in doing so it will be seen that the dates are very material, and that they fortunately show that the accusations against the Lord Chancellor on this head are entirely baseless. On the 7th May, Mr. Miller, who for twenty years had been the Chief Registrar, and in whom the present Lord Chancellor, like his predecessors, was accustomed to repose considerable confidence, wrote to Mr. Templer, one of the messengers at Leeds, requiring him to pay £1,600. The other messenger and the two official assignees received similar notices. They paid the sums found due from them, and so did the other messenger; but Mr. Templer refused. He was accordingly served with a notice to come into court and defend himself, and on the 2nd of July, 1864, he was suspended until he should come in. He came on the 23rd of July, three days before the letter was written to Mr. Wilde; he was heard by counsel; the case was fully considered, and the Lord Chancellor gave judgment, ordering him to pay the balance; but when the balance was paid the suspension was removed, and Mr. Templer was allowed to retain his office. It has been said that, because the Lord Chancellor required Mr. Wilde to do what he required Mr. Templer to do, it is evident that his Lordship desired Mr. Wilde's office, and that Mr. Wilde had no chance of a fair hearing. But Mr. Wilde knew what had been done in Mr. Templer's case, and knew that Mr. Templer had not been dismissed, but had simply been obliged to pay over the balance. Mr. Wilde was only one of numerous delinquents in the Bankruptcy Court against whom proceedings were taken. Mr. Payne was in the same position. He has made a communication to me with regard to my observations the other night. All I can say is that I have no desire to make accusations against him, and only use his case as illustrative of the views and motives of the Lord Chancellor in this matter. On the 16th of May, Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde received communications from the Lord Chancellor to the effect that unless they could explain certain charges made against them by Mr. Ayrton, one of the Commissioners, they would be served with notice to show cause why they should not be dismissed. These charges were substantially as follows:—First, that they had unduly certified that certain accounts had been sanctioned by Mr. Ayrton which had not been so sanctioned by him; secondly, that they had been in the habit of taxing the bills of the messengers without calling for the production of the necessary vouchers; and thirdly, that they had borrowed money both from the official assignees and messengers, thereby destroying their independence and efficiency. Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde totally denied the truth of these charges. With respect to the borrowing of money, they said that this was an old story, and that they were sorry they had done so, but that the money was now repaid. As to the auditing by Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Wilde explained that he did not mean to state that the Commissioner had sanctioned these identical accounts, but that he had sanctioned accounts with similar charges in them, and he thought he was entitled to proceed upon that footing. As to not requiring vouchers from the messengers, Mr. Wilde said he did not think he could go wrong in auditing his accounts as his predecessors had done. This explanation went to the Lord Chancellor about the 20th of May. Before deciding whether he would require Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde to show cause why they should not be dismissed, the Lord Chancellor asked for a second report from Mr. Ayrton, which was given on the 3rd of June, and sent on the 9th of June to Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde. There is some dispute as to whether copies of that second report ever reached them. The point is of no great moment, but these facts do appear—that copies were made of this additional report on the 9th of June; that both Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde knew that such a report had been made, for Mr. Wilde had said so before the 26th of July; and that they had both received a blank envelope coming from the Registrar's office, and had never inquired what that envelope contained. I think we may assume that this report reached them about the 9th of June—at all events, the Lord Chancellor had no reason to suppose it had not—and that down to the 26th of July they had given no reply. Now, up to the 26th of July there was no suspicion of the Lord Chancellor's motives in this matter, and it is not enough to acquit the Lord Chancellor of corrupt motives—the question is, whether he was not proceeding in the ordinary discharge of a public duty? The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hunt) said, that at that time there were relations between Mr. Welch and Mr. Richard Bethell. But what were the relations between father and son at that date and two months before? On the 13th of May, 1864, the Lord Chancellor received information which led him on the 14th to write to Mr. Miller stating that his son could no longer be allowed to hold his office. The hon. Gentleman said that Mr. Bethell could not have been fit for his office in 1863. But if hon. Members will refer to the evidence of Mr. Skirrow (Question 2,665) they will find that although Mr. Bethell had previously been a source of discomfort to his father, he had for a considerable time previous to 1863 been living quietly, and had given hopes that his former errors had been repented of. His father, therefore, thought he might be appointed to his office in 1863, and the duties of that office he continued to discharge without complaint down to 1864. It seems to be supposed that the Lord Chancellor should have made inquiry into something as to which he had no suspicion. But did he hesitate for a moment as to his course of proceeding? I shall not read the letters, but I must say they are creditable to the sternness and resolution of the Lord Chancellor, and although Mr. Miller begged for leniency, the Lord Chancellor would show none. It is said that Mr. Bethell went abroad because he was abliged to fly from his creditors. But that is not the fact—it was the Lord Chancellor who insisted that he should go abroad. Surely, it is enough to show the utter folly of the imputations that Mr. Wilde was to be driven out of his office for the benefit of Mr. Bethell, when, at the moment, proceedings were going on against Mr. Wilde, the Lord Chancellor had meted out much more rigid and speedy justice to this son of his, whose interests it was supposed he was promoting by the sacrifice of Mr. Wilde. In answer to Mr. Miller's remonstrance the Lord Chancellor wrote, stating that he would accept an act on Mr. Richard Bethell's resignation, and these were the terms in which the Lord Chancellor wrote to Mr. Skirrow—

> "After a sleepless night I can think of nothing better than the conclusions I mentioned yesterday. It is useless to attempt to make any arrangement founded on his retaining his office. It would be discreditable to me his being allowed to remain. He must leave the country immediately; Germany will be the best place of residence, but care must be taken to fix it in a country where the foreign holder of one of his acceptances could not sue him. All that he can do is to devote himself to the education of his children abroad. It will be greatly for the future benefit of his sons if they become good German and French Scholars. I

shall not listen to any proposal for his return to this country for some years."

That was the way in which the Lord Chancellor wrote about a son who, it is now assumed, had so much influence over him that he was listening to that son's opinion as to how public offices should be filled. It is not fair that a great reputation should be imperilled on suspicions and surmises like these. That the Lord Chancellor was sincerely indignant to the heart's core at what had occurred, and that he was determined that no parental feeling should prevent him from dealing out justice to his son, there can be no doubt, and I cannot understand how it could possibly be imagined that Mr. Bethell, who at that time was under a cloud so dark, should have the slightest influence in regard to the proceedings which the Lord Chancellor took. Mr. Bethell went abroad, and came back in September without the leave of the Lord Chancellor, who had never heard of him excepting upon one occasion by letter. If there is justice in this House—and I am sure there is—I am sure that not a single man, laying his hand upon his heart, would say that from the 13th of May, when the thunder-cloud broke upon the Lord Chancellor, down to the present time—at all events down to February, 1865, Mr. Richard Bethell's influence had anything to do with the filling up of these offices. But it is said that Mr. Welch had some influence, and it is insinuated that that was the reason why Mr. Wilde was so summarily dismissed and that Mr. Welch obtained the office. The hon. Member states that Mr. Miller was Mr. Bethell's friend. He was, and he did, whether wisely or not, his best to keep Mr. Bethell in office; but from the 15th of May, 1864, until February, 1865, the Lord Chancellor never saw or heard from Mr. Bethell. Therefore Mr. Bethell's influence could not have operated in his mind; and, as for Mr. Welch, he knew nothing about him except that in December he heard that Mr. Welch was applying for office. The hon. and learned Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) stated the other night that between the 15th of May and the 26th of July, Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch were applying to Mr. Miller for the purpose of procuring a vacancy in Mr. Wilde's office; but, unless my memory deceives me, there is not a word to that effect in the evidence. The evidence is conclusive that Mr. Miller had no communication with Mr. Welch; and as to Mr. Richard Bethell's relations with Mr. Welch the Lord Chancellor had no means whatever of suspecting their existence. The hon. Member who has proposed the present Motion (Mr. Hunt), pressed by the necessities of his position, says he does not mean to charge the Chancellor with knowing anything about these proceedings; but that he ought to have guessed what was going on. Why? The Lord Chancellor received testimonials in favour of Mr. Welch from leaders of the Northern Circuit. But then, said the hon. Gentleman, these testimonials are easily given in favour of any member of the Bar. I hope not; but, if so, the hon. Gentleman's Resolutions had much better have been directed against the leaders of the Northern Circuit than against the Lord Chancellor. Those gentlemen were persons of great name, and if their testimonials are misleading, how is the Lord Chancellor to protect himself against being deceived? I, however, am certain that not a single gentleman would have put his hand to these testimonials while entertaining a different opinion. The Lord Chancellor gave these recommendations the weight he thought they deserved, and the testimonials were to be found entered upon the Lord Chancellor's patronage book, on the 21st of May, 1864, after the disgrace of Mr. Richard Bethell, and after he had ceased to have any communication with his father. With regard to these transactions Mr. Miller's conduct does not appear very satisfactory, though I do not mean to say that there is any ground to impute to Mr. Miller the slightest motive as regards his own personal advantage. He, however, seems not to have exercised his functions with prudence in so important an affair, being acted upon by the sorrow he felt for the young man whose name was so much mixed up in these proceedings. Be that as it may, it is plain that Mr. Miller was not actuated by any motives with respect to Mr. Wilde's office, because it was on the 16th of May that he states he advised the Lord Chancellor to dismiss both Mr. Wilde and Mr. Payne together on the ground of Mr. Ayrton's report. Now we come to the 26th of July. The Lord Chancellor had waited for nearly six weeks, or from the 9th of June, the date when he supposed that copies of Mr. Commissioner Ayrton's report had been sent to Mr. Wilde and Mr. Payne; and in the meantime he had been considering the case of Mr. Templer, who manfully came forward to answer the charges against him, and to show cause why he should not be dismissed. He did show such cause, and he was not dismissed. If Mr. Wilde and Mr. Payne had taken the same course, they would have received an equally fair hearing. But on the 26th of July, no answer being returned by them, the Lord Chancellor felt that that could not be allowed to go on indefinitely, and said to Mr. Miller, "You must write and tell Mr. Payne and Mr. Wilde that they must come and show cause in open court why they should not be dismissed." I believe that Mr. Payne holds that he has been very illused, that there was no ground for his dismissal, and that he had not an opportunity of being heard. Far be it from me to pronounce an opinion on that point; but, be that as it may, was there any motive in regard to Mr. Wilde's case that did not equally exist in regard to Mr. Payne's? Was there any *protégé* of Mr. Richard Bethell's waiting for Mr. Payne's place also? We know that Mr. Payne, like Mr. Wilde, applied for his retiring pension; we know that Mr. Miller prepared the petition for the retiring pension for Mr. Wilde and Mr. Payne, doing precisely the same thing for the one as he did for the other, and that the Lord Chancellor, in filling up Mr. Payne's place as he did Mr. Wilde's, did not proceed upon any personal grounds, but appointed Mr. Stephens, whom he had never seen in his life, but whom he knew, as the editor of a professional work of some merit, to be a fit person for the vacant office. No doubt, Mr. Miller wrote in a strain which the Committee could not approve, and I entirely concur in their opinion on that point. In his letter he confused two matters which ought to have been kept entirely distinct—namely, the question of Mr. Wilde's showing cause why he should not be dismissed, and the question of a retiring pension. I think the two things are so distinct that they ought to be in separate hands. But, be that as it may, the Lord Chancellor gave no authority for this part of Mr. Miller's conduct. It is said that Mr. Miller's letter was couched in threatening and startling language—that he said Mr. Wilde must reply by return of post as to whether he would resign his office or not. At first sight it does seem strong; but it must be remembered that the matter was no new one to Mr. Wilde; he had had information that such a notice would be served upon him as far back as the 16th of May. According to his own statement Mr. Miller had waited six weeks for an answer, and was quite entitled to one. Besides this, Mr. Miller's letters are all peremptory — his is not the polite style of letter writing. If you look to the Report of the Bankruptcy inquiry, you will find that Mr. Miller adopts a similar style in other portions of his correspondence. He wrote, for example, to Mr. Templer about £1,100 which Mr. Templer owed; and, although that may be a sum not always at the command of a messenger in bankruptcy at an hour's notice, Mr. Miller peremptorily required it to be sent by the next morning. With regard to the medical certificate, the Committee express the opinion that the Lord Chancellor acted with undue haste and want of caution in allowing Mr. Wilde to retire upon a pension. I will not dispute that proposition, although I think the words are rather stronger than is necessary. It is very easy, when you have the whole surrounding circumstances before you, and are arguing this matter with something of the bias of certain quarters—it is very easy to apply the plummet and the rule, and to say it was not right for the Lord Chancellor to allow a retiring pension under such circumstances. In my opinion that letter was sufficient if it were right to allow Mr. Wilde to retire at all. But we have seen, not only in this, but also in the Edmunds' case, how facile is the transition from the accusation of driving an innocent man out of his office to the accusation of granting a guilty man a pension. Whether the Lord Chancellor gave this case all the consideration which it demanded is quite a different question. But you must look at how the matter stands. The charges against Mr. Wilde have been brought, more or less, against the officers of all these Courts. They have all failed sufficiently to audit their accounts—they have all, or at least a great many of them have, certified accounts without the proper vouchers. What the Lord Chancellor did with Mr. Wilde he must have done with them all. If he was prepared to dismiss Mr. Wilde without a pension, he must be ready to deal in the same manner with Mr. Payne, an old public servant of eighty-two. If that was just, of course he was bound to do it; but in carrying out a great reform of a system like that, was it not a fair matter for the Lord Chancellor to consider whether he should proceed with an amount of severity towards individuals with which public opinion might not sympathize, and against which local opinion unquestionably would strongly rebel? I say that that was a point which a statesman was entitled to consider. What were the circumstances themselves? The Edmunds' case has no analogy to this. That was a case of personal defalcation, where the party was accused of failure of duty for his own personal advantage. There was no such charge against Mr. Wilde. He was accused of borrowing money from his subordinate officer, but the amount was small, and he had repaid it; and the Lord Chancellor might have been content to administer a reprimand. Mr. Wilde said that Mr. Commissioner Ayrton had certified accounts when he really had not; but his explanation was, that he meant that Mr. Commissioner Ayrton had certified the same charges in the accounts of the previous year. He was accused of not examining sufficiently into the vouchers of the messengers; and his answer was, that that was true, but that he had only followed the example set him by Mr. Payne. We know that it is not so very long ago since charges for travelling expenses were made as a matter of course—that is to say, that officers who had not actually incurred them claimed and obtained payment for them. I am glad that the public officers are now better regulated. Well, the Lord Chancellor had to ask himself the question, "Am I to turn this man out of his office without any allowance, or am I simply to let him remain in office?" I think it would have been a harsh sentence upon Mr. Wilde to have turned him out summarily. The Lord Chancellor thought so, and I am not at all satisfied that if he had acted with the rigour which hon. Gentlemen opposite would now seem to approve, they would not have turned round and accused him of undue severity, and have found just as good reasons in their own estimation for imputing to him improper motives or the exercise of undue influence over him. Whatever excuses, however, might have been pleaded by Mr. Wilde for his conduct, they might not have justified his being permitted to retire on the allowance awarded to him; and certainly no intention to permit him to do so was expressed by the Lord Chancellor to Mr. Miller when my noble and learned Friend directed the latter to order Mr. Wilde to appear and defend himself. There was a question which the Lord Chancellor said might possibly be entertained—namely, whether Mr. Wilde should be allowed to resign; but the Lord Chancellor distinctly says he never suggested to Mr. Miller that Mr. Wilde should be allowed to retire upon a pension. Whether Mr. Bond, a solicitor at Leeds, is altogether a more impartial judge than the tribunal which I am addressing may be greatly doubted; but he states that Mr. Wilde brought him the letter directing him to appear and show cause why he should not be dismissed. Mr. Bond says, "I knew that it was a foregone conclusion." How did he know that? Did Mr. Templer get a letter of that kind, and did he not go and defend himself like a man, and did he not come back restored to his office? How did Mr. Bond jump so rapidly to his conclusion. It is plain from the evidence that Mr. Bond, to justify the sentence which he passes on that letter, recommended Mr. Wilde to become a party to that which he knew to be a fraud, upon the pretence that Mr. Wilde would not get justice if he went to defend himself in open court. Mr. Hey had recommended Mr. Wilde to retire on his pension, because he thought his eyesight had so much failed. Does not that prove that Mr. Miller was quite correct when he says that he knew that Mr. Wilde was in a position to obtain a certificate to retire? Why Mr. Hey was not called before the Committee I do not know; neither was Mr. Payne, although both might have given important evidence. There was not the same suggestion with regard to Mr. Payne; he was over age, and could retire on that ground alone. It is quite true that when the certificate came before the Lord Chancellor, he knew that Mr. Wilde's accounts had been in an unsatisfactory state. The Lord Chancellor says so himself. At the same time there was not only a certificate, but an affidavit and a petition. Mr. Wilde says that was prepared by Mr. Miller. That, undoubtedly, shows that he was very keen and absurdly officious; but Mr. Miller did for Mr. Payne the same that he did for Mr. Wilde. The certificate is in these terms—

> "Leeds, July 28, 1864.
>
> "I hereby certify that I have been consulted by Mr. Henry S. Wilde, on account of a failure in his sight, which was a serious hindrance to him in the performance of the duties of his office. Mr. Wilde first consulted me in August, 1863. At his age I cannot look for any improvement in his vision.—SAMUEL HEY, F.R.C.S."

That was written by a man who, as Mr. Wilde says, had advised him to retire, and the House will find that which is very important stated in answer to Questions 947, 948, 949, and 950—

> "How would you reconcile that statement with what you say in your petition, that you had for some time past been afflicted with a failure in your sight, and that it has now become so serious that you are no longer able to perform satisfactorily the duties of your office?—If I had had work to execute at night, I do not hesitate to say that I could not have performed it; that I should not have been able to have continued; I have had as many as twenty bills to do by candlelight, and I could not do it. I may state that sometimes, when I have gone from Mr. Hey's steps, I have had difficulty to find my way down. And yet it has never occurred to you to make any claim for retiring?—I did not do so; Mr. Hey suggested to me that I should get relaxation, but I did not find the inconvenience so great as to induce me to do so. Chairman: Mr. Hey did suggest?—Yes, he did. Colonel Pennant: When was that?—Some time before."

It was merely an accident that we discovered that; but if the House look at Mr. Bond's evidence they will find that he understood from Mr. Wilde he never had that advice from Hey. Mr. Wilde himself, in his petition, swears to the following effect. The petition, no doubt, was prepared by Mr. Miller, but it would have been a very odd thing for him to do so unless he had some reason to know how the facts stood. The petition is to this effect—

> "That your petitioner has for some time past been afflicted with a failure in his sight, and that the same has now become so serious that he is no longer able satisfactorily to perform the duties of his office, as appears by the certificate of Samuel Hey, a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, practising at Leeds, hereunto annexed, and is consequently desirous of retiring."

Is that not true? Mr. Wilde swears it is true in the affidavit. He came before the Committee, and said it was true. It may be that he intended to struggle on; but that will make the affidavit and the petition false? And even if the Lord Chancellor had not given his mind to it, is he to be liable to the censure of this House because he permitted Mr. Wilde to resign? Payne had been permitted to resign. I do not ask the House not to concur in that part of the Committee's Report, that it would have been better that the Lord Chancellor had directed his mind to the character of the certificate; but I deny that the offence committed is of that grave nature represented by the hon. Gentleman opposite. It is not a condonation of corrupt practices. The resignation was a deserved punishment inflicted on Mr. Wilde. The two things are entirely distinct. I have sometimes had matters of this kind to consider, and I cannot help thinking I should have acted in the same manner. More consideration should have been given to the nature of the certificate; but, on the other hand, I should not have hesitated to allow Mr. Wilde to retire on a pension, holding it best for the public that he should resign. He was punished by resigning his office. It would have been a severe sentence to have sent him adrift. Corruption extended to other Courts as well as Leeds, to other officials as well as registrars; and I do not know that the Lord Chancellor was called upon in the case of Wilde to make so very strong and stringent an example. But that is matter of opinion. I do not justify the Lord Chancellor; but the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Hunt) was himself obliged in candour to admit that you must deal with public men and offices according to the views of practical life. Public business could not go on for a single day if a Minister could not take for granted that a particular subordinate officer had performed his duty and signed particular documents—if, for example, the Secretary of State for the Home Department could not take Mr. Waddington's word for a great deal that goes on in that Office. It seems to be supposed that the Lord Chancellor was bound to suspect Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller had been for twenty years at the head of the working staff of the Bankruptcy Courts, which is only one of the onerous duties the Lord Chancellor has to perform. He had no reason to suspect him. I have been most anxious to see if any motive was attributable to Mr. Miller which he was ashamed to confess. I have found none. The Lord Chancellor knew none; and was he, therefore, to suspect him of a gross dereliction of public duty, because Mr. Hey, a gentleman well skilled in these matters, recommended Mr. Wilde to retire on a pension? There is a discrepancy, I admit, as to the Lord Chancellor's attention having been called to the certificate; I am myself inclined to think the Lord Chancellor's memory the more accurate of the two. But when you have said that you have said all. The Lord Chancellor may have been wanting in vigilance, but there is nothing whatever to give colour to the idea that he was in any way cognizant of any money transactions between Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Wilde. I do not think the House will feel disposed to go beyond the expression of opinion which the Committee have placed on record.

So much for the first chapter of my speech. I have dealt with the retirement of Mr. Wilde, and the appointment of Mr. Welch. When we are told that there has been indecent haste in the appointment of Mr. Welch, I ask, how is that shown? I think the contrary is the case. We all know that when official appointments are to be made, the sooner they are made the better. Then, what foundation is there for this attack upon the Lord Chancellor? It never had any foundation. It is based upon a delusion. The money transactions between Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Welch could have no influence on the appointment, if they were unknown to the Lord Chancellor, because Mr. Richard Bethell, not being in communication with his father for a long time, could not have exerted any influence in the matter. With respect to the transactions between Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Welch, I think it will be better for the House not to enter upon that question, especially as the Committee have recommended a judicial inquiry. I do not think it is possible to defend Mr. Welch upon his own statement; but still I cannot accept the story that is told against him without some further proof. Mr. Harding, who unblushingly comes forward to confess that he expected to receive a bribe of £333 6*s.* 8*d.* for being the go-between of Mr. Richard Bethell and Mr. Welch in the perpetration of a corrupt bargain, is not a wholly reliable witness. He is unworthy of credit. His story may be true or it may be false, but until he and a witness who did not think it prudent to attend before the Committee are submitted to examination upon oath in open court, I cannot consent to condemn Mr. Welch, although I cannot approve his conduct. But, putting that aside, and admitting that Mr. Welch did advance £500 to Mr. Richard Bethell in the beginning of May, and that there have been other money transactions between them, they had not and could not have any connection with the proceedings which the Lord Chancellor instituted against Mr. Wilde. I therefore shall not go into those matters. Mr. Welch may have had his own opinion of what would follow from the advances he had made; but I say that the Lord Chancellor is not in the slightest degree implicated with those transactions. Implicated do I say? There is not the slightest chain of evidence to connect him with transactions of which he was purposely kept ignorant. The curtain falls on July 31. Mr. Wilde had resigned. He now complains bitterly that he was frightened into resignation; but it was with an alacrity that I cannot comprehend that he jumped at Mr. Miller's suggestion and declined to defend his acts in court. The Lord Chancellor heard no more until February, 1865. Mr. Richard Bethell went abroad and came back in December, 1864. And here I wish the House to listen to two letters which Mr. Skirrow produced before the Committee — they show the strong feeling of indignation with which he looked upon the career of his son. The first is written after Mr. Richard Bethell came back to England, and in which the Lord Chancellor writes—

> "Sunday.
>
> "My dear Charles,—I am much disappointed at your not coming down to-morrow. . . . . As to Richard, it is hopeless; let him understand that I neither can nor will ask for any place for him. . . . . I will increase his allowance to £1,000 per annum if he will go and live in Dresden or some other proper place, and educate his children there, where they can be well brought up."

I appeal to all the Members of the Committee whether the evidence of Mr. Skirrow did not produce conviction on their minds. Well, on the 4th of January, 1865, Mr. Skirrow again went to the Lord Chancellor—and this is the account he gives of the interview. He says that whenever he referred to his son the Lord Chancellor assumed a different tone, and upon his quitting the room his Lordship put into his hand an envelope containing a letter addressed to his son, which he told him to read. Let the House remember that this letter is written by the man who on the 26th of the same month is supposed to have been influenced in the bestowal of his patronage by an article which appeared in some weekly paper. The letter ran—

> "Richard,—Nothing will induce me to give you the place of Clerk at the Table if it should become vacant; you have been a disgrace and a source of infinite sorrow and reproach to me during the last ten years. I have given you every opportunity of amendment, but there is no hope of you, nor have I the least confidence in your ever having better principles. I will not see you again. Your best course will be to go to the Continent, and try, by attention to your wife and children, to make some amends to them for the grievous injury you have inflicted on them."

Mr. Skirrow did not deliver that letter, and he says he is not very sorry that he did not. On the 18th of February Mr. Skirrow again saw the Lord Chancellor, who, so far from relenting, showed still more determination—

> "Accordingly, on Saturday, the 18th of February, I proceeded to Lincoln's Inn, where the Lord Chancellor was sitting. The Lord Chancellor had risen for the day, and when I went in I announced to him what I had come about. The Lord Chancellor was very angry. He said I had taken a very great liberty in pressing for any appointment for his son, and I remember perfectly that he did a thing which he never did before. He got up and left the room, and went to his carriage without taking any notice of me. I think it was on that day I saw Mr. Richard Bethell, and I told him I would fight his battles no longer, and that I could do nothing with the Lord Chancellor at all."

On the 22nd of February, Mrs. Richard Bethell made a heart-breaking appeal to the Lord Chancellor, and which he so far listened to that he said if Richard Bethell could settle with his creditors he would consider what he could do for him. But on the 26th he sent for Mr. Skirrow and told him that he regretted even saying so much, as he had information from Paris concerning his son's conduct there, and nothing should induce him to give him any place. Then, it is said that Mr. Miller prepared certain appointments in his office in the confident expectation that the Lord Chancellor would forgive his son; but it was made as clear as day before the Committee that the Lord Chancellor knew nothing whatever of this until he heard of it in the proceedings of the Committee; that it was entirely Mr. Miller's officiousness. How, then, can that derogate from the Lord Chancellor's position in the matter? I cannot discover the smallest taint of ignoble motives in the Lord Chancellor's conduct; he stands perfectly and thoroughly clear not only in my own mind, but in the minds of all who have studied the facts of the case. The proceedings in regard to Mr. Wilde are perfectly pure; the connection between Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch had no concern with them. The same thing would have been done had their names never been mixed up in the affair. Fortunately for the Lord Chancellor, the coincidence of events makes it impossible that the charges which have been made can be true; for at the moment the Lord Chancellor is represented as interfering for his son's benefit he was, in fact, compelling him to resign his office, and driving him from the country. I am ready to admit that the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) has treated the subject with much more taste and moderation than was manifested on a previous occasion; but his fine-drawn theories as to what the Lord Chancellor ought to have done, are just as unfounded as the direct accusations of the other night. The only thing which remains for me to touch upon is the retiring allowance to Mr. Edmunds, and at this late hour of the Parliament I did not expect this matter to be revived. It has been discussed and set at rest in another place. Now, the Lord Chancellor did not grant Mr. Edmunds' pension. It was granted by a Committee of the other House. The Resolution, I find, censures the laxity shown in granting pensions to officers over whose heads grave charges were impending. But why is that Committee omitted? Is it said that they were not aware of the position in which Mr. Edmunds was placed? On the contrary, I rather imagine that it has been made as clear as day that they, the custodians of the public purse in this matter, were perfectly well informed by public rumour and report of the position in which Mr. Edmunds stood. Why are they not included, then, in this Resolution? I do not intend to enter at any length into this question. If it be thought worthy of further discussion, other persons will do it justice. What I have endeavoured to do is to place before the House the views which occur to me on this particular case. I feel strongly upon it, because I think that the Lord Chancellor has been subjected to most unreasonable and unfriendly criticism for acts which arose out of the purest motives. Under these circumstances I feel convinced that the House will never agree to the indefinite and unintelligible censure which this Motion passes on a man so eminent for his abilities, who is an ornament to the profession to which he belongs, and who in his public station has unquestionably conferred great benefits on the country. I have detained the House at somewhat greater length than I intended, but I shall conclude by moving an Amendment. Though I admit such an Amendment might have come more properly from one who was not a Member of the Committee, yet, as neither my hon. and learned Friend, nor myself, took part in or were present at the deliberation of the Committee, I conceive that I am not bound by the Report, and am free to take such a course. The Amendment which I propose is as follows:—

> "That this House having considered the Report of the Select Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the evidence taken by it, agrees with the Committee in the opinion that the facts which are established acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge in the matters to which it refers, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde; but this House is of opinion

that some further check should be placed by law upon the grant of pensions to the holders of legal offices."

As to the latter part of the Amendment, it is not necessary to say much. It is quite plain that it is not convenient that the granting of retiring allowances and the exercise of patronage should be placed in the same hands. The effect of the Amendment is that the Treasury should have a control over these retiring allowances, as they have over superannuations, and it will relieve the administrators of patronage of all misconstructions. Had such an arrangement been in force, it would have been perfectly impossible that such a charge as this should ever have been made against the Lord Chancellor.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the first word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House having considered the Report of the Select Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the evidence taken by it, agrees with the Committee in the opinion that the facts which are established acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge in the matters to which it refers, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde; but this House is of opinion that some further check should be placed by Law upon the grant of pensions to the holders of legal offices,"—(*The Lord Advocate,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. HENNESSY said, that the House had now before it two Motions—the Resolution of his hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt), and the Amendment, of which notice had been given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. E. P. Bouverie). The main difference between the two consisted in the circumstance that the Resolution of his hon. Friend set out with the preamble that—

"The evidence taken before a Committee of this House on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court discloses that a great facility exists for obtaining public appointments by corrupt means."

And then went on to declare—

"That such evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the House of Lords in the case of Leonard Edmunds, and laid before this House, shows a laxity of practice and want of caution on the part of the Lord Chancellor in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to public officers over whose head grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices; that such laxity and want of caution, even in the absence of any improper motive, are, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible, and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the high offices of State."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. E. P. Bouverie) omitted the paragraph which stated that corrupt practices had existed, for the hon. Member for Northamptonshire did not charge them on the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The only subject matters before the House are the original Motion and the Amendment of the Lord Advocate. No other Motion has been put before the House.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that a notice had been given.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not in order in discussing a Motion of which notice has been given, but which is not yet before the House.

Mr. HENNESSY said, that the Amendment which the learned Lord had moved on the part of the Government related, as far as he could hear—for no notice had been given of it—only to the case of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court. Not one word was said in it about the Edmunds' case; and the House would have observed that the learned Lord had referred to that case very slightly in his speech, and not at all in his Motion. He (Mr. Hennessy) would take the liberty of recalling the attention of the House to that case, because it was one with which other Members of the Government were mixed up, and, as far as the conduct of Mr. Edmunds was contrasted with that of Mr. Wilde, it was a far worse case than that of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court. The circumstances attending the dismissal of Mr. Edmunds had been dwelt upon by the Report of the other House in language which was almost severe to the Lord Chancellor, and it was worthy of notice that, although that Report was only carried by the casting vote of the Chairman, an Amendment on that Report, which was negatived by the Chairman's casting vote, was much more severe. He found, also, that among the six Peers whose votes negatived that Amendment were the Lord President of the Council, the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Clarendon, and Lord Stanley of Alderley, so that four out of the six Peers were Members of the Cabinet. He would further endeavour to show that whatever blame was attached to the conduct of the Lord Chancellor in reference to this matter attached equally to many other Members of the Government. One of the gravest accusations against the conduct of the Lord Chancellor was that he had permitted Mr. Edmunds to resign two offices he held, and to retire with a pension after he had been charged with compounding a felony, and with appropriating public money. Now, who besides the Lord Chancellor knew of these charges against Mr. Edmunds, and of all the proofs which could be adduced in support of them, and yet sanctioned his resignation? In the first place, he would ask the House to listen to what the Attorney General stated before the Lords' Committee as to his knowledge on those points. The Attorney General was examined on the last day of the examination of witnesses before the Lords' Committee, and he informed their Lordships that he was aware of the transactions in which Mr. Edmunds was concerned at an early period. It appeared that in 1862 it was brought to the knowledge of the Attorney General that a clerk in the Patent Office named Smith had appropriated public money to his own use, and that Mr. Edmunds had assisted him in hiding the proofs of his offence. It further appeared from the evidence of the Attorney General that the first Report—the Report of 1863—of Messrs. Greenwood and Hindmarch was submitted to him not in his capacity of Commissioner of Patents, but in that of Attorney General, "and," added the Attorney General, "the Lord Chancellor desired me to frame charges upon that Report." He was then asked—

"You accordingly framed the charges which we have before us?—Yes; it was a sort of notice to show cause. And you were aware that he was summoned to show cause (so to speak) before the Lord Chancellor and two Vice Chancellors?—Yes. You knew the day when it was intended that he should appear, did you not?—I have no doubt I did, but I have not any distinct recollection of it. It was the 1st of August?—Yes. No doubt I knew what day was fixed. Before that day arrived was any communication made to you as to Mr. Edmunds having expressed a wish to be allowed to resign his office on paying all moneys due from him to the Treasury?—I remember that before the time had arrived when the hearing would have taken place, it was mentioned to me by the Lord Chancellor that Mr. Edmunds had proposed at once to give up that office. I do not recollect anything about paying; but I understood that he was to give such an undertaking as would leave the question of subsequent payment entirely unprejudiced by the acceptance of his resignation; that was what I understood at the time. I do not think that the form of any document came under my notice. I wanted to know whether you were consulted as to the propriety of allowing him to resign?—I have no doubt I was. My own personal recollection would hardly have enabled me to say whether the thing was actually resolved upon before it was mentioned to me, or whether it was mentioned to me first; it was about the same time, certainly; but I understand that the Lord Chancellor's recollection upon the subject is more distinct than mine. I have no doubt that it was mentioned to me before the resolution to accept the resignation was taken. The Lord Chancellor says that you concurred in opinion with him and the Master of the Rolls that Mr. Edmunds might be permitted to resign, upon his paying his money over?—Yes; I had not the least doubt about it. It appeared to me that exactly the same object was accomplished by his resignation as we had in view—namely, to get him out of the office; and the ulterior question, as to the payment of the money or any further proceedings, appeared to me to be kept precisely as it stood previously; perhaps it was in rather a more favourable position than if there had been a kind of rehearsal of the charges on that occasion, simply for the purpose of dismissing him from that office."

There was a very remarkable phrase made use of by the Attorney General in answer to a subsequent question—

"Our first object was to get rid of him, and we might not have been able to do that for months, perhaps, if we had not accepted his resignation, because he would have had it in his power to make the usual delays which any one can make who is not ready with his defence, and all the time everything would have been in a state of confusion in the office. I daresay I may be wrong; but I cannot present to my mind a case in which, under such circumstances, the object of the dismissal not being criminal justice, but the sole object being to obtain a vacancy in the office, there would have been sufficient reason for insisting upon a form of trial for that purpose, when the man said, 'I will give you no more trouble about it; I will resign myself.'"

Therefore they found that the Attorney General supported, and even went beyond the view taken by the Lord Chancellor, that the resignation of Mr. Edmunds was preferable to his dismissal. He would proceed to draw the attention of the House to what the Committee of the Lords said upon the subject. In page 5 of their Report, the Committee said—

"The Committee are compelled to express their regret that he was allowed to resign, and thereby withdraw himself from the impending inquiry before the Lord Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors. The Attorney General, indeed, stated that in his opinion it was desirable at once to remove Mr. Edmunds from his office, and that the acceptance of this enforced retirement was preferable to the delay which must have taken place in the inquiry. Notwithstanding this high authority, the Committee are still of opinion that the inquiry ought to have proceeded, and if the charges which Mr. Edmunds had been formerly called upon to answer had been proved (as it will be presently seen that in the judgment of the Committee the principal part of them must have been), he should at once have been dismissed, leaving it open to future consideration whether ulterior proceedings ought to be taken against him."

It would thus be seen that the Committee differed with the Attorney General and the Lord Chancellor as to the propriety of their having allowed Mr. Edmunds to resign. So far for the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney General. But was no other Member of the Government cognizant of what was going on? The Lord Chancellor, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee, over and over again said that he had informed the Members of the Cabinet of what he was doing, and that he had consulted the Members of the Government and the Law Officers of the Government as to what course he should pursue in the matter; and, therefore, all the Members of the Government must have been fully aware of all the transactions that had taken place in connection with Mr. Edmunds. One Member of the Government must have been particularly well aware of what was taking place. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, not only as a Member of the Cabinet had heard from the Lord Chancellor what had been going on, but he must have also heard of the transaction at the Treasury, because Mr. Greenwood, the Secretary to the Treasury, and Mr. Hindmarch sent in their reports from time to time to that department. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had also another opportunity of ascertaining all the circumstances of the case; for Mr. William Brougham, in a paper laid before the Committee, made the following extraordinary statement:—

> "When the dreadful discovery, that he had for years been using public money for his private purposes, first came to light, Leman begged me to come up to London to assist and advise. I at once took the journey, and got to London on the 10th of August last. I did all in my power to help, especially by using my influence with Mr. Gladstone, and successfully; from that time forwards, both Lord B. and myself supported Edmunds, contending and fully believing that he had a satisfactory answer to the charges against him."

That letter was written long before the public were aware of the dreadful scandals which were then hatching. Mr. William Brougham, acting as the friend of Mr. Edmunds, was striving to get the matter hushed up and to arrange the matter so that Mr. Edmunds might be allowed to resign and not be dismissed; and he strove "successfully," which word, strange to say, was printed in the Report in large capitals—and perhaps to show the ability and zeal with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had carried out his wishes. However that might be, at all events the Chancellor of the Exchequer must have been perfectly well aware of what was taking place. But, besides the Lord Chancellor, the Attorney General, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he found that some reference was made in the evidence to the noble Viscount at the head of the Government. In a letter from James Leman to William Brougham, the former suggested that something should be done as speedily as possible to hush up the whole affair—and who was to be applied to in the matter? Mr. Leman said in that letter—

> "It is of the greatest possible consequence that they," (the Members of the Government), "should be got at without delay, and for this purpose particularly I do entreat you will come to town, and as speedily as possible. In dealing with the Treasury it will be necessary to get at Lord Palmerston; and we do most urgently request your advice and help in the whole case."

It was a remarkable fact that but for that letter being laid before the Committee Mr. William Brougham would never have been asked whether he did go to Lord Palmerston in order to get him to hush the matter up. Mr. William Brougham had told them that he had gone to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and had succeeded with him; but there the evidence stopped short, and they were not told whether Mr. William Brougham went to the residence of the noble Viscount, and that the noble Lord showed him the door. This reference to the noble Viscount reminded him that Lord Palmerston was also mentioned in the Leeds inquiry; and upon this point he must say that some inquiry should have been made, not with reference to the noble Viscount, but with reference to some person to whom Mr. Welch said he was to pay the sum of £8,000; but not a single word was asked of Mr. Welch as to whom that mysterious person was. But going back to the Edmunds' case, it appeared that though the Government were fully cognizant of all that had taken place, and that the gravest charges were made against Mr. Edmunds, that gentleman resigned, but was not dismissed. Then came the question of the retiring pension on Mr. Edmunds resigning his office as Reading Clerk in the House of Lords. Did the Government know of that retiring pension? In the first place, the Lord Chancellor had very kindly promised Mr. Edmunds to do all in his power, with propriety, to obtain that pension. It was very remarkable he should have done that, for in several letters which were published in the blue-book he endorsed the words of Mr. Greenwood that the charges against Mr. Edmunds were of a "fearful character;" and the noble and learned Lord himself used the words "compounding a felony" in reference to Mr. Edmunds' case. Not only the Lord Chancellor, but the Government, must have known all about the retiring pension; for two Members of the Cabinet—the Lord Chancellor and the Lord President—were Members of the Committee of the House of Lords which decided pension questions. It was a singular coincidence, that neither of those noble Lords attended the Committee while Mr. Edmunds' pension was under consideration, yet they were both fully aware of what had taken place. Lord Redesdale, another Member of the Committee, subsequently stated that the Committee knew nothing about the charges against Mr. Edmunds when they were deciding on his claim. The Members had heard rumours of charges, but it had been stated that Mr. Edmunds had paid back, not only the amount in which he had been a defaulter, but a still larger sum; and an opinion prevailed that he was very badly treated, inasmuch as he had been got out of his office in the House of Lords for some purpose or other. Every Member of the Committee decided on the question in total ignorance of the criminality. The two Cabinet Ministers who were Members of the Committee did not attend, though they had been regularly summoned. Of course the Lord Chancellor, who had promised to do all he could with propriety to obtain the pension, knew what was taking place in the Committee; and yet the pension was granted in the dark, the Cabinet concealing from the Committee a material fact which it ought to have known. But, in addition to this, did not the fact of the granting of the pension come to the knowlege of Lord Granville the next day? Did it not come to the knowledge of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: How did I know it?] It was in all the papers. Every one knew it. He would be out of order in referring in detail to what had taken place in the House of Lords; but it was perfectly notorious from a debate which had taken place there, that every Member of the Government was aware of the fact of the pension having been granted. And what did the Government do then? Simply nothing. But a Committee of Inquiry was subsequently appointed. Unfortunately for the reputation of the Government there were too many of them on that Committee, for they were all on their trial as well as the Lord Chancellor; and the Committee adopted a Report condemning what had been done, and acting on that Report, the House of Lords, without the slightest hesitation, withdrew the pension that had been so improperly granted to Mr. Edmunds. The Cabinet and the Law Officers of the Crown were fully conversant with what was taking place, and every word in that Report which condemned the Lord Chancellor applied also to Her Majesty's Government, and every one who agreed with the hon. Gentleman opposite in thinking there was laxity of conduct on the part of the Lord Chancellor, calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the high offices of the State, must feel that Her Majesty's Government share with the Lord Chancellor that serious imputation. Throughout every step of the Edmunds' case the Members of the Cabinet were aware of the circumstances, and the Attorney General was instructed to draw the charges against Mr. Edmunds. He was sorry the learned Attorney General was not in his place, because he (Mr. Hennessy) wished to call the attention of the House to what the learned Attorney General said and did in that House in reference to the Question put to him a short time since in connection with the Leeds Bankruptcy Court by the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Ferrand). On that occasion his hon. Friend's statements were met with ironical cheers, in consequence of their having been blown to pieces by the answers given by the Attorney General. But what were the circumstances? On the 15th of May the Member for Devonport asked—

> "Whether Mr. Wilde, when Registrar at Leeds, was called upon by one of the Bankruptcy officers to resign his office; whether Mr. Welch was to make way for Mr. Richard Bethell; and whether Mr. R. Bethell's appointment was made out; and whether he attended the Bankruptcy Court at Leeds, and stated to officials that he was appointed registrar?"

In reply, the Attorney General said—

> "Mr. Wilde was not called upon by any official to resign. As to the alleged arrangement for benefiting the Hon. Richard Bethell, the answer is that no such arrangement was ever made or proposed, or thought of."

Whereas, in the blue-book now before the House, they found Mr. Miller, one of the chief officials of the Bankruptcy Court, writing to Mr. Wilde, saying, "You must resign by return of post." So much for the Attorney General's reply to the first question of his hon. Friend. As to his reply to the second question, surely such an arrangement was thought of by Mr. Miller, the Chief Registrar; it was thought of by Mr. Skirrow, a confidential friend of the Lord Chancellor's family, and a most respectable gentleman; it was thought of by every one around the Lord Chancellor; it was even thought of by the Lord Chancellor himself, though he repented him of the thought. Notwithstanding all that, the reply of the Attorney General was received with ironical cheers from the Government, directed against the hon. Member for Devonport; and, not satisfied with his triumph, the Attorney General came down to the House the next evening and made this statement—

> "With regard to Mr. Bethell, whom I understand to have been on a private visit to Mr. Welch, at Leeds, in February last, Mr. Welch says that Mr. Bethell did not attend at the Leeds Court of Bankruptcy in February or any other time, and all the officials to whom he has spoken deny that Mr. Bethell ever said he was appointed registrar, or that they ever said so; and they add that they do not even know his personal appearance. I may add that I have seen a letter from Mr. Bethell himself substantially to the same effect."

Loud cheers from the Government Benches of course greeted the hon. and learned Gentleman for having thus disposed of the statements of the hon. Member for Devonport. But what did the blue-book say? In the evidence of Mr. Carriss, at page 118, there was a very significant commentary on the replies of the Attorney General. Among the questions and answers in Mr. Carriss' examination were the following:—

> "Do you remember on Friday, the 24th of February, attending the Court before Mr. Registrar Welch?—I do. Did anything take place between you and Mr. Welch on that day, with reference to himself or Mr. Bethell, and if so, be kind enough to state what it was?—Yes. Mr. Welch asked me on that day if I had any objection to adjourn business which was standing for the following week, to the Friday in that week, in order that it might come before Mr. Bethell, as he himself was going to London, and Mr. Bethell was to have the appointment of registrar at the Bankruptcy Court at Leeds. Was it mentioned at all when Mr. Bethell would be at Leeds, or when he would take the business there?—Yes, on the Friday following the 24th of February, which would be the 3rd of March. Who told you that?—Mr. Welch asked me if I would adjourn the business I have mentioned till that day, in order that it might come before Mr. Bethell. Was the matter talked of in Leeds generally?—Yes, certainly; and I saw Mr. Bethell in court that day. Did Mr. Welch state that to you as a positive certainty, or merely as a possibility?—I did not understand it as a possibility; I understood that although Mr. Welch himself did not say he had got the appointment in London, he said he was going to London, but I understood it as certain that Mr. Bethell had got the appointment at Leeds."

The House would, therefore, remark that it was on the authority of Mr. Welch and Mr. Bethell, in support of his own statement, that the Attorney General so flatly contradicted the hon. Member for Devonport. Neither did Mr. Welch agree with the Attorney General; for, in page 85 of the blue-book, there was a letter from Mr. Welch to Mr. Miller, in which he said—

> "My dear Sir,—I take the liberty to write to you as the Lord Chancellor's minister in these matters. I have been expecting to hear from you with my appointment to the London Court in the Hon. S. Bethell's place, and which I was informed on this day week that the Lord Chancellor had that morning been kind enough to transfer to me. The Hon. Richard Bethell was here with me on last Friday and Saturday, and he told several of the Chancellor's having appointed me to London, and that he himself was to succeed me here."

So that, in fact, every word stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Devonport was true, and every allegation made by the Attorney General was untrue. But it did not end there. On the 18th of May the hon. Member for Devonport asked the Attorney General—

> "Whether he would lay upon the table the letters of Mr. Welch, the registrar, which he had read to the House on Tuesday last, as well as the letters of the Hon. Richard Bethell confirming the same."

What was the reply of the late Attorney General?—

> "I decline to produce them. I wholly decline, on my own responsibility, to produce them. Upon my own responsibility and good faith I gave to the House the information I had acquired from what I considered to be the proper quarter."

Again there was great cheering; but now it turned out that the whole of the information supplied to the hon. and learned Gentleman was false. He (Mr. Hennessy) would only observe that before the Attorney General so flatly contradicted a Member of that House, he ought to be more particular about his sources of information. If he had only spoken to Mr. Miller, or if he had taken the slightest trouble to inquire, he might have found that the statement of the hon. Member for Devonport was true, and that his own allegations were untrue. Now, it appeared that Her Majesty's Government were fully alive to the iniquity of the Edmunds' case, and yet allowed him to resign and subsequently receive a pension. It appeared, also, that the Lord Chancellor, not only made Her Majesty's Government fully aware of the proceedings in which he acted with great wisdom, but it also appeared, from his own evidence, that he himself did not peruse the charges against Mr. Edmunds. His Lordship stated, that as he might have to act judicially when the case came before him, and dismiss him, he accordingly avoided looking into the case; he handed it over to the Law Officers of the Crown, and the charges were prepared by the Attorney General; and, therefore, it appeared to him (Mr. Hennessy) that so far as the Lord Chancellor's personal conduct was concerned in that case, the other Members of the Government had acted quite as badly as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. Therefore, under the circumstances, he should be glad when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock's Amendment came before the House. He should vote for that in preference to the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire.

MR. DENMAN said, that since he had the honour of a seat in that House he had never risen to address it under a sense of deeper responsibility or with deeper pain; because he considered it one of the most important questions that had come before the House during his time, affecting the character not only of the Government, but of public men generally. The question had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt) in a tone and spirit highly creditable to him and becoming its great importance. At the same time it was all the more incumbent upon the House to be wary lest, owing to the very moderation of the tone and temper of the hon. Gentleman, they should be led to adopt a Resolution that might inflict the gravest and cruelest injustice upon the person against whom it was directed. There was, perhaps, no man in that House who personally had less reason to rise and defend the Lord Chancellor. He had scarcely any acquaintance with him, except that arising from a formal introduction as a member of the profession, and the only occasion on which his public duty had brought him into close relations with the noble and learned Lord in that House was once when, with that haste and violence of manner which did not render him a popular Member of that House, the noble and learned Lord, then Attorney General, told him that a certain claim which he (Mr. Denman) advocated, and upon which he contended the House ought to appoint a Committee, ought not to be brought forward to trouble the House as often as "any young lawyer" could be found to take it up. Now, a man who had been struggling fifteen or sixteen years at the Bar did not like to be called "any young lawyer"; but that was his closest experience of the Lord Chancellor. When, however, the present Resolution was brought forward he considered it his bounden duty, and that of all who were in the habit of examining testimony, to read and study from beginning to end the evidence on which this charge rested. The other night, when the matter was brought forward in an unfair way, he thought it his duty to stand up for the Committee whose Report to the House had been prematurely discussed. That Committee had been selected in the fairest manner; three of the Members sat on the Opposition side of the House and two on the Ministerial side, and they were assisted by two Gentlemen skilled in the examination of evidence, but not allowed to vote. The Report of such a Committee was entitled to the highest respect. The question was now brought forward again in another shape—in a shape that was objectionable on every ground. It was, in the first place, very difficult, if not impossible, to know what the Resolution meant; and in the next place it was so framed as by its apparent moderation to catch as many votes as possible, and yet so framed as if it were carried against the Lord Chancellor to make it impossible for him to continue to occupy his seat on the Woolsack for a single hour. The Government met the Resolution by another. He wished they had met it by a direct negative. He would rather have so met it, because he believed it to be unjust, untrue, and brought forward in an unfair spirit, with the objects to which he had alluded. The Resolution contained three heads. The first was—

> "That the evidence taken before the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court discloses that a great facility exists for obtaining public appointments by corrupt means:"

Now, he asserted fearlessly that the result of the examination before the Leeds Committee showed that no such facility did exist; but that, on the contrary, there was great difficulty in obtaining appointments by such means. Such an assertion was unjust to the holders of public offices, to the Government, and to the Lord Chancellor, as far as anything appeared to the contrary in the Report of the Leeds

Committee. The hon. Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt) disclaimed a desire to attack any one but the Lord Chancellor; but the House saw the cloven foot in the mild and moderate statement of the hon. Gentleman; and it was still more plainly displayed by the hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Hennessy), who might be called—more fairly than any one upon the Benches opposite, except perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks—the true leader of the Opposition. That hon. Gentleman had during this Session made more speeches, argued more points in debate, was oftener in his place, and conducted the attack upon the Government ten times more frequently than the right hon. Gentleman himself. And now, the hon. Gentleman said that the evidence upon the Edmunds' case affected not only the Lord Chancellor, but the head of the Government, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Attorney General. Well, but if that were the case, ought not hon. Gentlemen opposite to move a direct vote of censure upon the whole of the Government, and not by a side-wind to enable the real leader of the Opposition to come forward and make a covert attack upon the Government at large? The hon. Member for Northamptonshire laid very little stress upon the Edmunds' case; and now that some weeks had elapsed since the Committee on that case had reported, it was rather too late, and, indeed, unfair, to slip into a Motion brought forward *apropos* of the Leeds Report an allusion to the Edmunds' case, contained in a book as thick as the Leeds inquiry, and which, he would venture to say, not one hon. Member in a hundred had read through. The second assertion in the Resolution was as false as the first. It was—

> "That such evidence and also that taken before a Committee of the House of Lords in the case of Leonard Edmunds shows a laxity of practice and want of caution on the part of the Lord Chancellor in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to public officers over whose heads grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices."

He would admit that there were scraps and glimpses of truth about this part of the Resolution. ["Hear!"] Was it to be permitted that the House sitting as a Court of Justice was to laugh and treat such matters as trifles? He would undertake to show that in this case there was made against the Lord Chancellor a charge far in excess of any censure he might have deserved, and if this House were to accept it they would overrule the Report of the Committee. ["Hear!"] He was prepared for jeers, for he knew how difficult it was for that House to act judicially; but he trusted there were men on the other side who would feel themselves bound to decide in a spirit of justice. The second part of the Resolution declared that there were—

> "Laxity of practice and want of caution on the part of the Lord Chancellor in sanctioning the grant of retiring pensions to public officers over whose heads grave charges are impending, and in filling up the vacancies made by the retirement of such officers, whereby great encouragement has been given to corrupt practices."

Now, he would venture to say that in almost every particular that second charge was false. With regard to the Edmunds' case, that might be very soon disposed of. When the hon. Member for Northamptonshire spoke about the Edmunds' case, all he said was that he thought the Lord Chancellor had allowed the pension to be given without stating the facts, and that he was highly reprehensible for so doing. Now, the hon. and learned Member for the King's County had sought to couple with the Lord Chancellor the names of other persons. That other persons took the same view of the case as the Lord Chancellor was a ground not for attack on them but of defence for him. When the Lord Chancellor was supported by the Attorney General and by a learned Judge of the Court of Chancery, whose relations with the Lord Chancellor were commonly said not to be of a very friendly nature, when the Master of the Rolls, who was a man of the highest character, took a view of the Edmunds' case substantially the same as the Lord Chancellor's, this showed the injustice of the attack that was made upon the noble and learned Lord. His hon. and learned Friend had picked out a letter for the purpose of showing that all the Members of the Government were *in pari delicto* with the Lord Chancellor; and that was a sample of the way in which men's characters might be blown away in a matter like this, in which hon. Gentlemen could not be expected to go over all the documents letter by letter. His hon. and learned Friend read this passage:—"It is of the greatest possible consequence that they should be got at without delay," and he commented on it by saying that "they" meant the Government. [Mr. HENNESSY: No; I said Lord Palmerston. Read on!] The hon. Gentleman certainly said "the Government," because he (Mr. Denman) interrupted him at the time, and he had the strongest recollection of it. Now, that passage was contained in a letter from Mr. Leman to Mr. Brougham, and the passage immediately before the one which his hon. and learned Friend had quoted contained the following words: — "Lords C. and K. may very probably commit themselves to an immediate and unfavourable opinion, thereby effecting irretrievable ruin;" and therefore Mr. Leman says "It is of the greatest possible consequence that they should be got at without delay." So that it was Lords Cranworth and Kingsdown that were to be got at, and yet that passage had been read by his hon. and learned Friend to show that the Government were *in pari delicto* with the Lord Chancellor. His hon. and learned Friend had also the boldness to cite Mr. Welch, whose evidence was tainted in every possible way, to show that he had lent a thousand pounds to a relative of the noble Lord [Mr. HENNESSY: I said it ought to be inquired into.] It was competent for his hon. and learned Friend to move for a Committee of Inquiry next Session if he thought so; but upon such a base suspicion it was an unworthy thing to assume that there was any complicity between the Government and the Lord Chancellor, if the Lord Chancellor had done anything wrong. But it was idle to go into such arguments as these, and the hon. and learned Gentleman merely alluded to them in the capacity which he had lately filled of leader of the Opposition. Having said quite enough about that, he would appeal to the Report of the Committee itself on the Edmunds' case. Nothing could be stronger than the finding of that Committee acquitting the Lord Chancellor. Looking to what had since occurred it was a misfortune that the Lord Chancellor had not taken a stern, unpitying, and what some might call a cruel view of that case. But, at all events, in accordance with the opinions of the Master of the Rolls, of Lord Cranworth, and Lord Kingsdown, and of several Members of the Government, the Lord Chancellor did not think it his duty to go further into the matter of the Edmunds' case. They, as well as the Committee who investigated the case, felt that they had got rid of a bad public servant, and that there was no use in going any farther into the case for the purpose of raking up the misconduct of an unhappy public servant who, in consequence of his misdeeds, had lost his situation. It was not, therefore, necessary for that House to go one whit beyond the finding of the Committee of the House of Lords. They would be not only acting wrongly, but discourteously towards the other House of Parliament if they were now to overhaul the decision of a Committee of the Upper House. He would now make a few observations on the Report of the Leeds Committee, and he apprehended that the Resolution was quite as false with regard to that as to the Edmunds' Committee. The Resolution stated that the evidence "shows laxity of practice and want of caution." It was said that Mr. Welch obtained his office at Leeds by corrupt means, because he paid a sum of money to Mr. Bethell; but the evidence proved nothing of the kind. Mr. Welch produced testimonials to his character and ability such as no Judge on the Bench would have hesitated to act upon. He had testimonials from Mr. Temple, the leader of the Northern Circuit; from Mr. Edward James, who ranked next; Mr. Manisty, who had a large business there; and Mr. Udall. These were four gentlemen whose words would be taken as strictly accurate. He (Mr. Denman) had seen these gentlemen since; and, of course, knowing what had since happened, one and all of them regretted that they had given these testimonials, but they had all assured him that at the time they knew enough of the man to know that what they said of him was well deserved. To say, as the hon. Member for Northamptonshire had said, that those were testimonials which any barrister on any circuit would get, was a deliberate insult to the leaders of every circuit, who would give no such testimonials unless they believed what they said to be true. Then it was said that the Lord Chancellor should not have made this appointment, because Mr. Bethell once said something in favour of Mr. Welch. Now, however much a father might disapprove the scampishness of his son, was he, when a man's name was mentioned to him by the son, at once to jump to the uncharitable conclusion that the man must have his son deeply in his books, and that it was upon that account only he had recommended him for the situation? But that, after all, was the *gravamen* of the charge against the Lord Chancellor as regarded the appointment of Mr. Welch. Surely in this respect the Lord Chancellor had ample justification for his conduct; and if he was to be judged fairly, and not by insinuations, doubts, and inferences, he was entitled not only to an acquittal but an honourable acquittal at the hands of this House. The next point to which the hon. Member referred was the resignation of Mr. Wilde. Now, he had looked carefully into the papers on this subject, and the evidence respecting it was supplied in what he must call the candid statement of the Lord Chancellor himself. The Lord Chancellor admitted that he felt there was a painful inconsistency in calling upon a man to show cause why he should not be dismissed, and in afterwards letting him retire upon a pension. This was the strongest point against the Lord Chancellor; yet, after all, it amounted to very little. The hon. Member said, Mr. Hey's certificate was unsatisfactory. Certainly, if the surgeon's certificate was looked at upon special demurrer with a very critical eye, it could not be thought satisfactory. But reading it in good faith, might not even an acute man be deceived by it? The certificate as to the failure of his vision was dated "28th July, 1864," and went on to say—"I hereby certify that I have been consulted by Mr. H. S. Wilde." Surely any person reading that would understand from it that he (Mr. Hey) had been consulted at that time by Mr. Wilde. It would never have occurred to him (Mr. Denman) to suppose that this medical man had never been consulted except a long time before by Mr. Wilde. It was true, as was subsequently disclosed, that Mr. Wilde had consulted him as far back as August, 1863; but there was nothing in the certificate to show that he had discontinued consulting him between that period and July, 1864. Now, it was stated that the Lord Chancellor had had his attention called to that certificate; but that assertion rested upon the testimony of Mr. Miller, who was contradicted over and over again by more than one witness as well as by Mr. Miller himself. Now, he apprehended, if they were called upon to decide as to which of the parties was telling the truth, they would naturally take those witnesses against whose veracity there had never been any impeachment. Well, then, if they were to act upon this principle in the present case, they must believe that the Lord Chancellor did not see that certificate. It was said that the omission of the Lord Chancellor to read the certificate was of itself a very grave offence. If so, it was an offence committed every day by the fifteen Judges who sat on the other side of Westminster Hall; for they constantly decided motions founded on affidavits referring to documents annexed thereto, and drew up their orders without reading the affidavits or documents, trusting to the accuracy and fairness of counsel. That was the offence for which the Lord Chancellor was charged to-night with a high misdemeanor. In Mr. Miller's position it would have been his duty to read the certificate, and state whether it was regular; it would not necessarily be the duty of the Lord Chancellor to read such certificate himself. But the certificate was a mere scrap in the case, in the presence of the petition and affidavit upon which the Lord Chancellor acted. These were drawn up most improperly by Mr. Miller, who had evidently set his heart upon doing the thing almost by a trick; and this was just the man who would be likely to place the documents before the Lord Chancellor in such a manner as to prevent him from exercising his judgment upon them. The petition and affidavit stated, on the oath of Mr. Wilde, that he was afflicted by the failure of his sight, and that this affliction was now so serious that he was no longer able satisfactorily to discharge the duties of his office, reference being made to the medical certificate annexed. What was the Lord Chancellor to do upon such evidence? The hon. Gentleman said that there was contradictory evidence upon this point, and called attention to the evidence of Mr. Miller, who said that the Lord Chancellor stated he was of opinion that, "coupling the language in the petition, and the affidavit, and the medical certificate together, there was a sufficient case to enable him to make the order." The Lord Chancellor did not contradict this statement point blank. His Lordship's evidence upon this was—

> "I have no recollection of any such thing. The petition, affidavit, and certificate were presented to me, and I ought in strictness to have read them all; I do not think that I did. I probably looked at the petition and saw the allegation, and I may have assumed that the medical certificate was in conformity with it."

So ought the Judges in Westminster Hall in strictness to read every document before making their orders; but they were not in the practice of doing so, unless they had reason to believe that something was wrong. They almost invariably acted upon the information of counsel or the officers of the Court, and no one ever thought of blaming them for the course which they pursued. If the Lord Chancellor, not only assumed that the medical certificate was in conformity with the petition and allegation, but was also, as was very probable, informed by Mr. Miller that such was the case, he could not see that—

> "Such laxity and want of caution were, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible, and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the high officers of State."

He would now ask the House if there was anything reprehensible in the mode adopted by the Lord Chancellor of filling up the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Edmunds as charged in the former part of the Resolution. Mr. Slingsby Bethell who was appointed to the post was the second son of the Lord Chancellor. That gentleman had filled the office of registrar with the highest credit, and that fact had indeed been admitted by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire himself. [Mr. HUNT: Hear, hear!] If the House laid down a rule forbidding such appointments, they would establish a rule forbidding a practice which had always existed, and which would be contrary to the known aspirations of Lord Chancellors appointed by either side of the House for hundreds of years; because Lord Chancellors had always looked forward to exercising the valuable patronage intrusted to them for the benefit of their relations and friends, if those relations and friends were qualified to perform the duties of the offices to which they were appointed. The duties of Mr. Edmunds' office were not very onerous. They consisted partly in reading documents, and he believed the hon. Gentleman would acknowledge the documents were read by Mr. Slingsby Bethell as well, if not better, than they were ever read in the House of Lords or any other place, where duties of a similar nature were to be discharged. The Resolution proposed by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire was, however, as direct a censure upon the appointment of Mr. Slingsby Bethell as it was upon that of Mr. Welch. His hon. Friend had in his speech referred to the question of a "plot," the object of which was to place Mr. Richard Bethell in the Leeds Court; but upon that part of the case the defence of his hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate had been complete. It was true that, after a solemn determination never again to appoint Mr. Richard Bethell to any employment whatsoever, the Lord Chancellor appeared for a moment to relent; but how? The terms which he suggested might be regarded as absolutely impossible, for they were nothing short of an entire release of Mr. Richard Bethell by his creditors. They heard that that gentleman's debts amounted to £20,000, and they heard also of some attempt on the part of Mr. Skirrow to procure his release; but there was not a particle of evidence in the Report to show that Mr. Skirrow ever could or did come to the Lord Chancellor and, after stating that all matters had been settled, ask him to re-consider the question of an appointment upon these grounds. Beyond that statement about a release, the Lord Chancellor had positively refused to give his son a vacancy, and that notwithstanding the fact that the pain and sorrow which he naturally felt was increased by the representations of his nearest and dearest friends, who told him that his conduct towards his son was unnecessarily harsh. But the hon. Member for Northamptonshire attributed the final decision of the Lord Chancellor upon this matter to an article which appeared on the 25th of February in a newspaper, although he did not name the newspaper to which he referred. But he did not, in fact, alter his tone between those dates, for he always said the same thing. The Lord Chancellor discovered, however, between the 22nd and the 26th of February that his son, after all his promises, had been again gambling at Paris—for he believed it was nothing worse—and, on ascertaining this fact, his Lordship not only determined to give no appointment to Mr. Richard Bethell, but was angry with Mr. Skirrow and Mr. Miller for saying a word in his favour. It should be remembered, too, that from May, 1864, the Lord Chancellor had absolutely refused to see his son. The conditions imposed by the Lord Chancellor were, as he had said, nearly impossible; but, supposing for a moment that they had been effected, would the hon. Gentleman say that the Lord Chancellor ought to have refused his son an appointment, because he had compounded with his creditors? His hon. Friend might be right in his argument; but it would be laying down a rule of strict morality which would reflect upon Members even of that House, who in former days had failed, or whose youthful follies had clung round their necks like the Old Man of the Sea. Such a rule would, to Sindbad, be a cruel one to men now the ornaments of the party in whose favour they made speeches and recorded their vote. It would, in fact, be regarding a man who had once been encumbered with debt as a rogue in all matters. He might remind the House that Mr. Richard Bethell had discharged the duties of his office in an efficient manner. On that ground Mr. Miller had stated in his evidence that there was no cause for his dismissal. Though he had never met Mr. Richard Bethell more than once, no one could be in that gentleman's society without perceiving that there was no want of ability on his part to prevent him from performing the duties of any such office as those to which it was said that he was to be appointed. There was one circumstance which the hon. Member for Northamptonshire laid stress on, and which he should hardly have thought that any one would have pointed to as a proof of misconduct on the part of the Lord Chancellor. The hon. Member contrasted the Lord Chancellor's statement that he had not the least knowledge that Mr. Welch had lent money to Mr. Bethell before the appointment was made, with the answer, which the noble and learned Lord gave to the Question—" If your Lordship had been aware of it, would the appointment have been made?" Well, a dishonest man would have said, " Certainly not;" but, as the case had not arisen, the Lord Chancellor said, "It is difficult to say what I should have done, but I think I should not have appointed him." The hon. Member quoted that as a suspicious matter against the Lord Chancellor, whereas it was evident that the noble and learned Lord wished to give a scrupulous answer, intimating that he could not reply to a hypothetical question. The last Resolution—

> "That such laxity and want of caution, even in the absence of any improper motive, are, in the opinion of this House, highly reprehensible, and calculated to throw discredit on the administration of the high offices of the State,"

was undoubtedly proposed with the view of forcing the Lord Chancellor to resign, if it should be carried. But that Resolution ought to be read in connection with the particular cases mentioned in the two preceding Resolutions, and being so read, it was an unjust and unfair Resolution. If the hon. Gentleman or the hon. Member for the King's County could have pointed out any facts proving that the Lord Chancellor had been guilty of anything like gross misconduct, he would have been ready to vote for the Motion; but he trusted that the House would not, by a party vote, insist upon driving from office an illustrious Judge and a great law reformer on account of certain errors of judgment, only such as many others had committed.

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE: Sir, I have given notice of an Amendment to the Motion of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, which, in consequence of the Lord Advocate having proposed another Amendment, I am now precluded from moving; but should the Motion of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire be negatived—as I trust it will be—the question for the House to decide will be what words should be substituted, and I shall then propose my Resolution. Hon. Gentlemen who, with me, are on this side of the House stand in a different position from that of the hon. Members opposite. They cannot be expected to place any confidence in Her Majesty's Government; but, as forming Her Majesty's Opposition, they may be expected to be willing to express want of confidence in them. But Gentlemen on this side of the House cannot be included in the same category, and I, for one, during the whole of this Parliament now about to expire, have placed my confidence in the present Government, and have been in the habit of supporting them by my votes and voice. I must, however, make one exception in regard to my confidence in Her Majesty's Government, and must distinctly declare that I have no confidence in the Lord Chancellor's administration of his high office. Such, I think, must be the feeling of everybody reading the evidence taken by the Committee, respecting the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, with an impartial desire to arrive at a sound conclusion. I put aside all question of corruption, and I think the Resolution of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire objectionable because—though not perhaps explicitly—it does more or less mix up the Lord Chancellor with the corruption which, undoubtedly, exists among other people. Now, the Committee which was as impartially nominated as any Committee could be, came to the conclusion that no imputation of personal corruption could be made against the Lord Chancellor with respect to the appointment of Mr. Welch. I concur in that conclusion, and I trust the House will also concur in it. I must admit that the facts as originally laid before the House looked ugly enough, and were calculated to cast a suspicion on the great head of the law; but the examination of the case by the Committee fairly dispelled those imputations;

and I understand that the hon. Member for Northamptonshire himself stated, whatever inference might be drawn from his Motion, that he did not intend to impute any personal corruption to the Lord Chancellor. [Mr. HUNT: Hear, hear!] There were two questions which the Committee had to consider—one, the imputation of corruption; and the other, whether in the administration of his high office the Lord Chancellor paid that proper regard to the public interest which we expect to be shown by a high officer of State; and I must say that the Resolution mixes up the two questions, and does not call on the House to find a distinct verdict with regard to each of them. In my judgment the Lord Chancellor must be honourably acquitted of any personal corruption; but there were corrupt practices under him, connected with his office of a gross and vile character, which the House should condemn; and this is another reason why I object to the Resolution, because it contains no distinct declaration that those corrupt practices were going on. No one could read the evidence and compare the dates of the occurrences without arriving at the conclusion that there was a corrupt agreement between parties below the Lord Chancellor with respect to the office of registrar of the Bankruptcy Court at Leeds. There is a misprint in the Report, the correction of which makes the case stronger. It is stated in the Report that on the 16th of April, 1864, Mr. Welch wrote to the Lord Chancellor pressing his former requests; whereas it appears from the evidence that the real date of the letter was the 30th of April, and the date of the check for £500, proved to have been post-dated a few days, was the 6th of May. Mr. Welch became aware at the time that Mr. Bethell was likely to leave his office. Mr. Bethell fixed that date himself as a fortnight before his own resignation, which would be just concurrently with the giving of this check—so that the evidence of a corrupt agreement is as strong as possible. But is not, I would ask, the fact of such corruption notorious? Notoriety, however, it will be said, is no evidence; but, then, if we are at all to listen to rumours current throughout society in London, we can have no doubt that this is not a solitary case. And what, let me ask, is the result of such a state of things so far as the public is concerned? What honest or honourable man can, under such circumstances, have reason to believe that he may trust to his own character and services to obtain office, and who will risk office, who relies upon his merits alone to ground his claim? I could not help being reminded, when I read of those things, of lines applied by one of our English satirists to times of notorious corruption —

"'When men like these,' the patriot cries,
'To honours and employments rise,
I ask no favour, seek no place,
From such, employment is disgrace.'"

I am not, I may add, at this point about to enter into any special pleading about the minutiæ of evidence. I leave that to those Gentlemen who have got a brief for the defence, and who may be prepared to throw doubt and suspicion on many features of the case. To my mind the main allegation that there was gross corruption connected with these offices is not to be shaken, although the Lord Chancellor may not have been directly cognizant of the fact. Now, when, forsooth, we suppose that we are purer than our ancestors a new mode of obtaining pensions from the public has been discovered. Bribe a Lord Chancellor's son or brother with money or promises of money; thus obtain the office you desire, then rob the public, or wink at its being robbed by others; then get found out as party to this malversation and you may apply to a facile Lord Chancellor for a retiring allowance, and in that way you may obtain from the public a pension. In my opinion, whatever we may think in doors, these things going on round the Woolsack have a great effect on the public mind. Men are shocked to find that transactions which took place in times connected with our past and least satisfactory annals can possibly exist in our own day. Take the officers of the Leeds Court of Bankruptcy—Messrs. Wilde and Payne. We now know that they did not perform their duty, and that the money which ought to have gone into the public purse was appropriated by the officers of that court. Accounts were certified as having been examined when no examination took place, and as having been audited when there was really no audit at all; the proceedings of those officers being wound up by their borrowing money of others subordinate to them whom it was their business to superintend. Now, whatever colour anybody may try to put upon the matter, these were gross malpractices deserving of the censure of this House. Payne's case, to which the Lord Advocate referred, was fully as bad as that of Mr. Wilde's. He was guilty of exactly the same offence, and was treated in exactly the same way. After having been called upon to show cause why he should not be dismissed from his office, because he could not adequately account for his malpractices, he receives a mild suggestion that he should retire. He is summoned before the Lord Chancellor to say why he should not be dismissed, and in the next moment he receives a suggestion that it is expedient he should retire —that retirement meaning that he should receive a pension from the public. Upon this point Mr. Miller was very distinct. He states, that in case of those officers who had given no satisfactory account whatever as to why they had permitted the malpractices to which I have referred in respect to accounts which they were bound to superintend the suggestion of a retirement on pensions came from the Lord Chancellor himself. The Lord Chancellor, however, does not appear to have recollected this circumstance. I do not wish to rest this statement merely upon my own assertion. In answer to a question put by Mr. Bovill the Lord Chancellor said that this must have been a mistake on the part of Mr. Miller, and that he could hardly have understood what he said. "I most unquestionably," he adds, "gave Mr. Miller no sort of authority to say anything to Mr. Wilde on the subject of his retirement." Then Mr. Miller also states that he had drawn the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the unsatisfactory nature of the certificate with regard to Mr. Wilde's health; but upon that point also the Lord Chancellor says he has no recollection. Now, I would here observe that I, for one, have no confidence whatsoever in the memory of the Lord Chancellor. Upon this point I do not come to a decision solely from the immediate inquiry under our notice, but also from what occurred in the Edmunds' case before the Committee of the House of Lords. It was important for that Committee to ascertain whether the statement made by Mr. Leman, to the effect that he had an interview with the Lord Chancellor on or about the 8th of November, in which he said the noble and learned Lord distinctly told him that if Mr. Edmunds wished to retire on a pension he would have no objection, was or was not correct. The Lord Chancellor hesitated when questioned upon the point, and said—

> "I do not believe I ever sent for Mr. Leman except on the 4th of October."

When asked whether the interview had not taken place on the 8th of November, his answer was—

> "Mr. Leman's memory some years ago was much better than lately. I have no recollection of sending for Mr. Leman at that time, nor do I think I did so."

Now, the Lord Chancellor's memory, with respect to this interview, appears to me to have been extremely treacherous, for Mr. Leman, in answer to a subsequent question which was put to him, said—

> "Having seen the statement of the Lord Chancellor this morning, I looked over my papers and found one dated the 6th of November, fixing a meeting with him for the next morning."

I contend, therefore, that we ought to prefer the positive statement of Mr. Miller, confused and unsatisfactory as it appears to be, to one which rests solely on the recollection of the Lord Chancellor. And I maintain that in this instance the noble and learned Lord has been guilty of a dereliction of duty in giving to the officers in question a retiring pension without any inquiry into the malfeasances which were brought to light. If, however, this was the only case against the noble and learned Lord, the grant of these retiring pensions might be attributed to haste; but how is it possible to get over the case of Mr. Edmunds? Is it not startling to think that the Lord High Chancellor of England, knowing this man to be a public defaulter of the very worst description, and that he had been robbing the public year after year, should allow him to come before the House of Lords, and present a petition to that august body for a pension, and say nothing of the defalcations and delinquencies within his special knowledge of this man. I am not led away by party spirit in this matter, and I ask, is it possible to say that the country can have confidence for the future in the mode in which the Lord Chancellor deals with these matters? Can we feel as certain as we should do with regard to many members of that honourable and learned profession that the same circumstances would not happen again with that noble and learned Lord still holding that great post—supposing this House to be willing to condone these acts? I say that I am not satisfied, and I could not feel satisfied that at any time something fresh would not be discovered which would shock us quite as much as these things have done. Well, what is the meaning of the Amendment of my right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate? Why, that there has been a little haste on the Lord Chancellor's part. A little haste! I say there was something worse than haste in the manner in which he neglected his bounden duty to the public. And then, forsooth, the Lord Advocate suggests that a change is required in the law. I say that the law itself is a perfectly right and good law, if it were only properly administered. You must trust some one to execute these high functions, and who is to be trusted unless it is the person who occupies the high and important post of Lord Chancellor? What possible check can you have—*quis custodiet ipsos custodes*—if the Lord Chancellor cannot be trusted properly to discharge this public duty? Sir, I will not detain the House at this late hour in the evening, but I say that this is a question of confidence in the Lord Chancellor, and after what has passed I beg leave to affirm, for myself, that I have no confidence in him. I doubt whether he is a proper person to fill these high offices. His ability none of us dispute. Many of us have been witnesses of it here, and we shall all agree that it is of the first order. But what is the value of that ability unless it is guided by sound discretion—and is possessed by a man in whom we can place confidence—a man who will duly discharge those grave duties which have nothing to do with his political functions, but which are committed to him for the benefit of the country?

MR. HUNT: Sir, the Lord Advocate having moved an Amendment, I believe I am entitled to make an observation. I do not rise to occupy the time of the House by going again into matters with which I fear I have already wearied the House too much; but my right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Bouverie) having intimated his intention of moving an Amendment, of the terms of which he gave notice early in the evening, in case my Resolution should be negatived, all I have to say is that his Amendment entirely expresses my own views, and the views which I believe I have expressed in the remarks that I made at the opening of the debate. And as I understand that my right hon. Friend opposite and certain other Members think the words which I have placed on the paper do not with sufficient explicitness exonerate the Lord Chancellor from the imputation of personal corruption, I am sure the House will feel that I did so in my speech. If there is any ambiguity in my Resolution, I am certainly desirous that there should be none; and I am, therefore, perfectly willing to allow my Motion to be negatived in order to let in the Motion of my right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock, which I shall have much pleasure in supporting.

MR. HOWES, as the Chairman of the Committee, rose to express his strong approval of the course just taken by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, in accepting the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock. The announcement which that hon. Member makes relieves that part of the House (the Opposition) from the possibility of what might be a serious imputation—namely, the possibility of its being supposed that that Motion rested upon a party basis. It relieved himself personally, and also he believed several other Members of the Committee, from some difficulty; for some of them could not have agreed to the Motion as it originally stood. The Committee were absolutely unanimous in all their resolutions and decisions—there was no one point on which they differed, setting aside those minute shades of difference which must arise when almost any question has to be considered by different minds. He would only make one reference to what took place last week. He had left London, as other Members of the Committee had done, feeling certain that no notice whatever could be taken of that matter until the evidence was printed; and he regretted deeply that any notice of it whatever had then been taken.

VISCOUNT CRANBOURNE begged to call his hon. Friend to order. He was referring to a past debate, and that was the more unjust as the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) was not in his place.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member had not made a reference to a former debate in the sense of animadverting or commenting upon it, but had only mentioned it as a fact that had taken place.

MR. HOWES could assure the House that he was not going to make any further reference to that former debate except to express regret that it had occurred. There was only one expression used by the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. Longfield) on that occasion to which he wished to allude.

MR. SPEAKER intimated to the hon. Member that that would be irregular.

Mr. HOWES would then only say that he cordially agreed with the terms of the Motion as proposed by the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock, who expressed fully the sentiment of the Committee. But he could not agree with the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Lord Advocate, because it simply echoed so much of the Report as acquitted the Lord Chancellor, and took no notice whatever of that part which condemned him. The part of the Report which condemned him was that which stated that the grave duty was imposed upon him of seeing that certain facts were ascertained, that the person on whom that duty was laid was no less a person than the Lord Chancellor of England, that the object for which that duty was imposed was the public good, but that that duty was not done. It seemed to him that, having said so much, whether they used the word "haste," or "want of caution," or "negligence," they had said all that was needful, and that the same High Officer having been guilty of neglect of a similar kind in the case of Mr. Edmunds, it was absolutely necessary that some notice should be taken by the House of that dereliction of duty.

Mr. HUSSEY VIVIAN said, that as a Member of the Committee he unfortunately could not take the same view that his hon. Friend the Chairman had just expressed. The Committee were entirely unanimous; the words proposed by the Lord Advocate that evening were copied from the Report of the Committee, and he felt bound to support there the very words which he had supported upstairs. A good deal more was implied in the Motion of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock. He thought it would be quite impossible for the Lord Chancellor to continue to occupy his high office if that right hon. Member's Motion were carried. Now, that either was or was not based on the investigation which the Committee had made. As a Member of that Committee he could not for one moment say that the evidence was in any way sufficient to cause him to give a vote which would have the effect of forcing the Lord Chancellor to resign his office. He said distinctly that neither in the case which was investigated in another place nor in the case which was investigated by their own Committee, could he conceive that the evidence was such as to warrant the House in adopting such words as would cause the Lord Chancellor to resign his office. He had not the slightest wish, nor did he feel anxious to advocate the cause of the Lord Chancellor in any shape or form. Purely judicial functions had devolved upon him as a Member of the Committee. Those functions he had discharged to the best of his ability, and with, he believed, strict impartiality; and the conclusion to which he now came was, he thought, equally impartial. In the evidence submitted to the House he saw no ground for forcing the Lord Chancellor to quit his office, and it was his determination to support the words of the Committee.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, the position in which we find ourselves placed by the determination just expressed by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, appears to me, I confess, somewhat extraordinary, and is perhaps one that is not very convenient. ["Hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite, I admit, can put their own construction on my words, but my meaning was simply this—that when notice is given of a Motion, and we have an opportunity of considering its terms, it is certainly not in a high degree convenient that we should have suddenly substituted for it another which is not upon the notice paper, and the terms of which we have had no such opportunity of considering. But, fortunately, we are in a great measure relieved from that difficulty by the tenour of the speech of my right hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Bouverie), who, whatever may be the terms of his Motion, distinctly says that he tenders it to the House as a vote of want of confidence in the Lord Chancellor, with the express purpose and intention of driving that noble and learned Lord from office. I do not wonder that under these circumstances hon. Gentlemen opposite should so willingly accept it, or that it should appear to them to be so convenient a Motion. But, of course, I need not say that if that be the case, the House and the country will not be misled by this change in the form of the Motion, and they will not be led to think—whatever any hon. Gentlemen may say who in this House are no longer subject to those judicial obligations and sanctions to which they are subject in Committee—the House and the country will not, I say, be led to think that this is the mode in which we shall be likely best to support the decision of the Committee which we have appointed. The House has a duty on this occasion—a very grave one—to discharge to its Committee, to the Lord Chancellor, and to the public. Well, Sir, I cannot accept, even from so very honourable a source as that of the Chairman of the Committee—I cannot accept even from him, sitting in this House, and being, doubtless, not willing to separate himself from those among whom he sits—I cannot accept the interpretation he has put on the plain language of the Committee, however convenient it may be for the other side of the House. What is the Amendment submitted by my hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate? It is expressly an affirmance of the decision of the Committee, in the very terms in which the Committee have expressed it. I beg leave once more to read it—

> "That this House having considered the Report of the Select Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the evidence taken by it, agrees with the Committee in the opinion that the facts which are established acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge in the matters to which it refers, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde; but this House is of opinion that some further check should be placed by law upon the grant of pensions to the holders of legal offices."

What are the words of the Committee? Towards the conclusion of their Report, summing up, they say—and it is consistent with everything said before—

> "They must be allowed to observe, in conclusion, that while the facts which they believe to be established by the evidence, acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde."

Is there a Member of the Committee in this House who will vote against that? And is there anything in the Report affecting the Lord Chancellor different from that? The hon. Member for Northamptonshire says the pension was granted hastily and without due examination. Hon. Gentlemen opposite show the wonderful acuteness with which they can distinguish in these matters. They see one meaning in the words "hastily and without due examination," and another in "haste and want of caution;" but I apprehend the country will not be able to discover any difference between the two forms of expression. The Committee pronounce their verdict in terms which we adopt in the Amendment of the Lord Advocate, and I take these words and ask the House to express their assent to that conclusion. And I take the liberty of adding that the Amendment of the Lord Advocate is far more for the public interest than that which it proposed to substitute for it; because the public interest is not so much to express an opinion on the conduct of this or that person, unless indeed he is seriously considered to be a delinquent against whom public justice demands severe measures to be taken, as that advantage should be taken of disclosures made on this as on other occasions in order to correct defects that exist in the law, and that errors of this description should not be committed if they can by any means be avoided. My right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock says there is no fault in the law—that the law is perfectly right, and that the Lord Chancellor is the person by whom these pensions ought to be granted. The Amendment of the Lord Advocate takes issue on that point, and I ask, is it right that pensions of this description should be granted by persons not ordinarily conversant with the management of the public purse, who ordinarily have in view only professional and legal considerations? or, is it right that this class of pensions like all others—those of the civil and diplomatic service, for example—should be referred to the Treasury and be under the entire superintendence and authority of the Treasury? I own I should have thought, but for what has fallen from my right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock, that there could not have been two opinions on that point, and that all must agree that the present anomaly of such pensions being granted by the Lord Chancellor and other judicial officers ought to cease. It will be a very great benefit to the public and a relief to those intrusted with judicial duties that such responsibility should be taken from them and given to the guardians of the public purse. The Amendment of the Lord Advocate adopts the conclusion and verdict of the Committee, and recommends an alteration and improvement of the law, for the future, providing safeguards against the recurrence of any haste or want of caution leading to similar results. But, having said so much with regard to the interests of the public and the affirmance of the conclusions of the Committee, I beg leave to make some observations on the duty which I venture to think the House owes to the Lord Chancellor in this matter. Is it or is it not the duty of the House to consider whether, if the findings of this Report are correct, the Lord Chancellor ought to be subject to such censure as that proposed by my right hon. Friend? What were the different points referred to the Committee? First, the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Wilde. It has been admitted by every one who has spoken that the conduct of Mr. Wilde in his office was such that it was for the public benefit he should not continue to hold it. Those who heard the candid and able statement of the Lord Advocate are probably also of opinion that it would have been a greater degree of severity than had been meted out in any similar case, if Mr. Wilde had been absolutely dismissed and not permitted to retire with a pension. The facts are very simple. Mr. Wilde made the usual statement, verified by affidavit, that there was sufficient cause from the failure of his sight for not continuing in his office, the duties of which for thirteen years he had discharged in a manner which no one would dispassionately say required dismissal, although most persons would be of opinion that he had discharged them in an inefficient manner. He verifies his petition by affidavit. No one can call in question the sufficiency of the cause as stated in these documents, and but for circumstances that directed so much attention to this case it would not have occurred to any one reading the certificate that it was in any way different from the certificate and petition of any other applicant for a retiring pension. The Lord Chancellor himself is the principal cause of the censure which is brought against him on this point, because he admits he did not give the certificate that particular examination which he ought to have done. For the rest of the case nobody would visit him with severe censure, because the statement of the petition and affidavit would naturally be believed by every one reading them. No one was entitled to suppose that the certificate was not honestly given. The Lord Chancellor says he did not particularly advert to the certificate. The business of his office is of a very onerous and overwhelming kind. I cannot for a moment believe that the House would think there was a sufficient ground for the vote of want of confidence in the Lord Chancellor so as to drive him from office because he gave credit, in this respect, to his subordinate officer. If this part of the case stood alone, would the House think it worthy of this censure? I cannot suppose for a moment that this would be looked upon as sufficient ground, if it were not for those other matters, as to all of which the Lord Chancellor has received most complete vindication in the Report. Is it just, in a case where matters so trivial are mixed up with matters so grave, to avail yourselves of these grave matters, though, in themselves not substantiated, so far as the Lord Chancellor is concerned, in order to give the more trivial matters a weight which not one of you in your conscience can believe attaches to it? Is that reasonable—is it just—is it candid—is it worthy of the House of Commons? I would request every hon. Gentleman to ask himself this question—Would you have been prepared to concur in a vote of want of confidence if there had been nothing but this, that the Lord Chancellor, in granting a pension to an officer whose contiuance in office was undesirable, but whose offences were not sufficient to warrant his dismissal, had not given sufficient attention to the form of an affidavit? That I do not think anybody would have done. But for other matters as to which by your lips you profess to acquit the Lord Chancellor, you allow yourselves to be drawn into Resolutions on this paltry ground, which you would not have thought of under other circumstances. I believe in your consciences you cannot deny that, and I must say that I heard with the most profound astonishment something that fell from my right hon. Friend (Mr. Bouverie). Anything more foreign to what I should have thought likely to receive acceptance in this House I never heard, and yet it was received with not a few cheers from the other side of the House. He said "no doubt, notoriety is not evidence." But he went on to say, "If we are to listen to rumours current in society there can be no doubt this is not a solitary case." Is that the ground on which hon. Members are going to vote to-night? Then, what a farce it was to appoint a Committee upstairs to examine into evidence upon which the Committee acquits the Lord Chancellor of everything. ["Oh!"] Why, the hon. Gentleman who made the Motion (Mr. Hunt) distinctly disclaimed any imputation of corruption against the Lord Chancellor, and the right hon. Gentleman behind me (Mr. Bouverie) did the same. But we are told of whispers and rumours out of doors, of matters of notoriety which are no evidence at all, and we are therefore to take it for granted that this is not a solitary case. No doubt there are, and have been, rumours out of doors which have imputed corruption; but when these rumours have come to be judicially examined by a Committee they have been utterly dissipated. And yet you fall back now upon other rumours

—matters of notoriety! Is that the way justice is to be meted out to persons filling such high offices as that of Lord Chancellor? I apprehend that is not the view which the House at large will take. But I wish to make an observation upon the Amendment of my right hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Bouverie), which I was astonished to hear was to be supported by Members of the Committee. He thinks it expedient that the House should declare by its vote that there have been corrupt practices connected with officers under the Lord Chancellor which the House should condemn. Now, what did the Committee recommend upon this subject? They said—

> "The statement of Mr. Harding is irreconcilable with that of Mr. Bethell and Mr. Welch. Mr. Harding's statement, if true, discloses a corrupt bargain between the three parties; if false, it is a gross attempt at extortion. One or other of these conclusions would be established hy a judicial investigation of the facts of the case; but, as each of them involves the liability to a charge of a highly penal character, your Committee, not having the opportunity of examining witnesses upon oath, or of bringing the persons inculpated to a formal trial, purposely abstain from expressing any opinion as to which of the two views above mentioned ought to be adopted. They consider it their duty to observe that the indisputable facts are such as to render it essential to the public interest that the case should, as soon as possible, be made the subject of legal investigation."

What did the Government do when that Report came before them? They determined to act upon the Report. They consulted the Law Officers of the Crown, whether the evidence justified the institution of legal proceedings, being determined to take those proceedings unless the Law Officers should say on their responsibility that there was not sufficient evidence to warrant them in taking that course. But the Committee did not say that, while this consultation was proceeding, it was necessary to prejudge and pre-determine the case by a Resolution in this House. If legal proceedings are to be taken I would humbly advise the House to adopt the recommendation of the Committee; but the right hon. Gentleman invites the House to do that which the Committee refused to do, and to declare beforehand that the evidence establishes a case of corrupt practices. I will not deny that a case might be imagined in which it might be expedient for the House to take that course—a case where it had been shown that, behind the Lord Chancellor or other high officers of State, there were persons with frequent access to him who were in the habit of selling for money or other corrupt considerations the patronage which it was his duty to administer. But what does the evidence in this case come to? That a spendthrift son of the Lord Chancellor, who, a year before these things happened, had mentioned casually to the Lord Chancellor the name of an acquaintance as a person he recommended for a particular office, that son being in difficulties, raising money wherever he could get it, accepted an advance of money upon the understanding that he would use his influence to procure for the same person the same office—he being at that time in such circumstances as makes it obvious that he never afterwards did use, and never could use, any influence for that purpose. It is clear that these are circumstances which can in no way tend to cast a general suspicion upon the purity of the public service—it is a case against which no conceivable safeguard can be raised, but which may, most properly, be left to be dealt with by the ordinary methods of law. Who are the persons besides the Lord Chancellor against whom the charge of corruption is made? Much has been said about Mr. Miller, but I do not find that any charge of corruption is made against him or against any person except Mr. Welch and the unfortunate son of the Lord Chancellor. Any candid person reading the evidence would adopt the conclusions of the Committee. Reference to the case of Mr. Edmunds has been made. In that case, I must say that I think undoubtedly the Lord Chancellor did commit an error in not taking upon himself the responsibility of communicating the facts relating to Mr. Edmunds' case to the Committee of the House of Lords. But if that was so grave an error as to justify a vote of want of confidence in order to remove the Lord Chancellor from his office, the time has gone by at which that course might have been expected to be taken. It is some months ago since that was discussed. [Mr. HENNESSY: It was May 17.] Well, we are now at July 3. There have been abundant opportunities for any hon. Member to propose a Motion on that subject. Do hon. Gentlemen opposite expect it to be believed that they really intended to make any Motion concerning the Edmunds' case, when they have postponed it until now? [An hon. MEMBER: We did not expect a second edition of it.] Just so. If this second case had not come out we should have heard nothing of any such Motion. I ask that each of these cases should be fairly considered upon its own merits; and if it is clear that the Lord Chancellor could have had no corrupt motive in the case of Mr. Wilde, although he may be open to slight reflection for haste and want of caution, yet it is impossible to make it a more serious matter by importing the case of Mr. Edmunds into the consideration of the case of Mr. Wilde. Of the other things you profess to acquit the Lord Chancellor, but you take advantage of them to assist in this attack. As to the case of Mr. Edmunds, the House will remember that it was not the Lord Chancellor who granted the pension, and that the facts relating to that case were matters of notoriety long before. I know that I read a concise account of the general facts connected with the Edmunds' case in a newspaper in the autumn of last year, and they were notorious to most, if not all, of the Members of the House of Lords who granted that pension. Although I concur with the Committee of the House of Lords, that it was an error of the Lord Chancellor not to officially communicate the facts to them, yet it is impossible to conceive that many Members of the House of Lords were not as cognizant of all the most material facts as the Lord Chancellor himself. The Committee, in fact, fell into the same error that the Lord Chancellor did. Will the House allow me to ask them to look on the other side of the question? Is it true that the Lord Chancellor has not had at heart in all these matters the public interest? Who was it that set the Patent Office inquiry on foot? Who discovered the gross abuses by which the public had been defrauded? The Lord Chancellor. I beg to remind hon. Gentlemen that those abuses had been going on unsuspected since 1832, under two Conservative Governments, as well as under several Liberal Governments, and it was reserved for the present Lord Chancellor to ferret out the abuses, to remove the offender, and to recover for the public a very considerable sum of money. Nor was there any secrecy in that inquiry. It was known to many persons. The Lord Chancellor, in his zeal for the public service, did inflict upon that individual a very severe punishment, and only did not interfere to prevent him from receiving a pension upon his retirement from a different office, in which no misconduct had been imputed to him, because he did not wish to take the responsibility of deciding upon himself. I agree that it would have been better if the Lord Chancellor had taken that responsibility upon himself; but those who are disposed to pass a fair and just—I will not say a generous—judgment, will consider in some degree the great service done to the public in instituting these inquiries and exposing those abuses. So it has been in the matters connected with bankruptcy. We know that the Lord Chancellor has incurred odium at Leeds and throughout the country because, on its being represented to him that there were gross abuses prevalent among the local officers, he insisted on searching into those matters thoroughly; thus he communicated many facts (including the proceedings and correspondence in the particular case of Mr. Wilde), to the Committee which sat to consider the subject of bankruptcy, he corrected many abuses and punished, always mercifully, many offenders. Can any one say of his patronage generally that it has been marked by any want of consideration for the public service? Ecclesiastical patronage has been spoken of; but be it remembered that the Lord Chancellor is the first who, for what he considered the public benefit, surrendered about 300 livings, many of them of no inconsiderable value. And what as to his judicial patronage? My hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Hunt) justly said that it would be a most serious thing if any doubt were thrown on the purity of judicial patronage. But has the Lord Chancellor, advising the Crown as to the higher judicial patronage, done nothing to entitle him to the acknowledgments even of the other side of the House? Has he not recommended men to sit on the bench without regard to party considerations? Was not the last Judge who now does honour to the bench taken from the ranks of the opposite side? Not for want of good men here, in and out of Parliament, well qualified to fill that office; but because the Lord Chancellor desired to take the man who, all things considered, was the most qualified and the best fitted for the office. The other night it was suggested that if the Office of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy had been established by Parliament the Lord Chancellor might have made some unworthy appointment; but it was not long after the passing of the Bankruptcy Act that Parliament passed a law concerning the transfer of land, and under that law an office of some value was created, a chief registrarship with not inconsiderable salary and not inconsiderable responsibility. Did the Lord Chancellor consider to whom he could give that office on grounds of personal or private favour? No; he selected for that office another gentleman who had borne a distinguished part on the other side—the brother of the late Sir William Follett—whose appointment has given universal satisfaction. But has his desire to consult the public good in the administration of his patronage been confined to offices of this high degree? I venture to say that all who have observed the manner in which the County Court Judgeships have been bestowed will agree in bearing testimony to the anxious desire the Lord Chancellor has shown to bestow them for qualification and merit, without regard to personal or party considerations. And I have been informed from many quarters that if the House could know how these Registrarships in Bankruptcy have generally been bestowed, they would see no reason to believe that they have been an exception to the regard for the public benefit which had characterized his administration. These are matters which the House ought to consider before it agrees in a vote of this kind. If this is all that can be brought against the Lord Chancellor, that having severely punished Mr. Edmunds he did not like that his own hand should strike the final blow; that, when he had determined that Mr. Wilde ought, on public grounds, to retire, he did his duty in examining the claim of that individual to a pension, in too cursory and perfunctory a manner—looking to the shining merits of this great person, looking to his eminent and long public services, and to the total failure of the attempt which has been made to bring against him charges of a graver complexion and character, will not the House say—

> "Non ego paucis
> Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit,
> Aut humana parùm cavit natura,"

and refuse to concur in this unworthy Motion of my right hon. Friend?

MR. E. C. EGERTON said, he had intended to remain perfectly silent in this debate until he heard the speech which had just been delivered by the Attorney General. He sat on the Committee to which had been referred the disclosures connected with the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and which, unanimously absolving the Lord Chancellor from any corrupt motives, imputed to him want of caution in granting retiring allowances. But when the House was asked to whitewash the noble and learned Lord—when they were asked to put him on as high a pedestal as any of the great men who had ever sat on the Woolsack, they were bound to take a wider range and consider what the Lord Chancellor had done in other cases. He had not had the good fortune to hear the beginning of this debate; but when he read, being in the country, the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire, he felt it was impossible for him to say "No" to it. He felt that, though he had been a Member of the Committee which acquitted the Lord Chancellor of any corrupt motives, yet, looking at the different circumstances connected with the Edmunds' case, looking at the circumstances which, as the Attorney General said, were matters of notoriety throughout the length and breadth of the land, he believed the House, exercising the highest judicial functions, was bound to see that the great Officers of State were perfectly free from all suspicion. It was for that reason that he was sorry to hear the vaunting speech of the Attorney General. It would have been far better if the hon. and learned Gentleman had left the matter where it remained with the Report of the Committee which acquitted the Lord Chancellor of corrupt motives, but imputed to him a want of caution, which, in his position, was a grave matter. Speaking as one who had never shown any great activity in political matters, and who had no strong political bias, and was sorry to do anything to injure any public man, he did not see how he could refuse his assent to the Motion of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock.

MR. HENLEY: I am one of those who were unable to vote for the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for the county of Northampton, because I thought the language was so obscure that it might possibly leave the sting of corruption which my hon. Friend did not intend. But the speech of the hon. and learned Attorney General has laid down such strange propositions that I cannot help commenting upon them. The Motion before the House took into consideration the whole conduct of the Lord Chancellor; but the Amendment of the Lord Advocate altogether passed by what took place elsewhere, and confined itself to the narrow ground of what passed before the Leeds Bankruptcy Committee. It is hardly likely that the House would so narrow the question. But the Attorney

General argued in the strongest and in the most excited manner that it was not reasonable that this House should take into consideration two sets of circumstances analogous in their character and occurring in the same Session, because their disclosure did not take place within two or three months of each other. [An hon. MEMBER: Six weeks.] This is a position so extraordinary that I cannot help commenting upon it. Of a single transaction it might be said that it would not occur again; but when two transactions like these come together it would hardly be the duty of Parliament to pass them by without attaching blame where it was due. Now that is what the Resolution of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock does. But it goes one step further, and it says that no man can continue in these sort of transactions without giving rise to all sorts of public scandals. That is the reason why I shall cordially support the Resolution of my right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock. It separates all charges of corruption from the Lord Chancellor, and it says—what I believe is the truth—that this laxity gives rise to improper transactions. Mr. Welch distinctly states that he had lent money to many persons to get their good offices, and that he had lent £500 on this very occasion. It is, therefore, impossible to say that there have not been corrupt practices. I do not believe that the money had anything to do with the appointment, but there is no doubt that money was given that it might be done. Though I am the last person to wish to press heavily on any public man, I must say that when two matters of this sort are brought forward—one in the other House so strong that they deprive a gentleman of a pension they had previously voted him, because they thought it had been obtained by the withholding of information which ought to have been laid before them; the other a case in which our own Committee has reported that the Lord Chancellor showed great want of caution—we should not be doing our duty if we did not say that such a course of action was worthy of reprehension. Whether that will have such an effect upon the Lord Chancellor as to make him dislike remaining where he is is not our business. But we should be going from our duty if we did not express our opinion upon transactions brought before us.

COLONEL DOUGLAS PENNANT, as a Member of the Committee, wished to say a few words in reference to what had fallen from the Attorney General. The hon. and learned Gentleman taunted the Members of the Committee with giving their votes this evening for party purposes. In answer to that charge he could only say that the first moment he saw the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Northamptonshire in writing he went to him and told him that the first paragraph of it contained an assertion which was not borne out by the evidence taken before the Committee. That assertion conveyed the impression that facilities existed for obtaining public employments by corrupt means, of which there was not evidence before the Committee. Therefore it was not in his power to vote for the Motion which his hon. Friend brought forward. That, he thought, settled, as far as he was concerned, the charge of voting from party motives. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock avoided that point and met the justice of the case, and therefore he should give it his support.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. E. P. BOUVERIE said, that he proposed to negative the admission of these words, and afterwards to move the insertion of those of which he had given notice.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: Sir, the course which has been taken with regard to the original Motion places this matter in an altogether new position. The Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hunt) clearly implied a charge of corruption against the Lord Chancellor. ["No, no!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] That is my opinion, and it is the opinion of many others. That was a very grave charge, and one which it was absolutely necessary to resist at the first opportunity that presented itself. The hon. Gentleman has abandoned that charge; and it appears to me to be the unanimous conviction of the House that no charge can justly be brought against the Lord Chancellor upon the ground of corruption in the administration of his high office. We have now, however, before us two Amendments, both of which have been brought before us for the first time in the course of this evening—one, that of my right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock, which he read to the House in the course of his speech, but which I apprehend a great number of the Members of this House have had no opportunity of weighing in their minds. Now, under these circumstances, it appears to me that, as this is a grave question—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock stating that the object which he has in view is to call upon the House to declare that it has no confidence in the Chancellor, and that is, no doubt, a matter of very considerable importance as regards an officer in his high position, and a Member of the Government—it seems to me that the House is not at the present moment in a condition—the Government is not in a condition—to determine in what way they will deal with that Motion. My right hon. Friend takes, as it appears to me, a very narrow view of the grounds upon which public confidence ought or ought not to be reposed in a public officer. He is of opinion that in consequence of the particular way in which certain pensions have been granted he cannot place confidence in the Lord Chancellor. My hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General has described how the Lord Chancellor has disposed of patronage much more extensive and much more important in a manner highly deserving the confidence the country. The House should also recollect the great improvement in every branch of the law which the present Chancellor has introduced, and which, whatever may be the opinion of this House with regard to his tenure of office, will, I venture to say, render his name illustrious among those of the great reformers of the law of this country. It is not necessary to enumerate the various improvements of which he has been the author. The consolidation of the Statute Law, by which it has been reduced from forty-four volumes to ten, the practical abolition of imprisonment for debt, and many other improvements affecting every class of the community. My hon. and learned Friend was therefore entitled to say that, whatever may be the opinion of my right hon. Friend as to the necessity for withdrawing confidence from the Chancellor in consequence of the grant of these pensions, the disposal of his great patronage and the manner in which the Lord Chancellor has performed his great and important duties, as the head of the law, do entitle him to the confidence of this House and of the country. As I said before, we are now, I think, embarking upon a new discussion, quite different from that which was suggested by the Motion of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, and I should therefore propose that this debate should be adjourned until to-morrow [*loud cries of* "Oh, oh!" *and* "Divide!" *and* cheers], in order that we may be enabled well to consider the Motion of my right hon. Friend, and the grounds upon which he has recommended it

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Viscount Palmerston.*)

MR. DISRAELI: I cannot help thinking that the proposition of the noble Lord is one which the House will not find it convenient to adopt. The subject has been discussed very amply to-night, and with reference to the objection that the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman is not in print, I cannot forget that the Amendment of the Government has also not been printed; but, even under that disadvantage, we were prepared to give it a due and fair consideration. I also think that, considering the position in which the House is now placed, there is an air of mockery in proposing to adjourn the debate. It appears to me that this is a question upon which the House ought at once to pronounce a decision. The House has been unusually well attended throughout a lengthened debate, and it is in my opinion quite qualified to come to a decision at once. I trust, therefore, that the noble Lord will re-consider his proposition, and will allow us to pronounce an opinion upon the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman. If, however, he persists in his strange proposal to adjourn the debate—whether to the next Parliament or not we are not informed—I shall, under the peculiar circumstances, consider it my duty, however generally unwilling to resist such a proposal from a Minister, to oppose the adoption of that course. [*Cries of* "Divide, divide!"]

SIR GEORGE GREY: The right hon. Gentleman has suggested that the object of my noble Friend in moving the adjournment of the debate was to avoid a decision upon this question, and he professed ignorance whether the noble Lord did not intend to adjourn the discussion until next Parliament. My noble Friend, in making the Motion, said distinctly that all he wished for was an adjournment until to-morrow, in order to give the House an opportunity of considering the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock, which very few Members even heard read. If the House should agree to the adjournment, my noble Friend will to-morrow state, on the part of the Government, the course which they intend to pursue. [" Divide, divide ! "]

Question put:—The House *divided*:—Ayes 163; Noesl 77: Majority 14.

VISCOUNT PALMERSTON: I merely wish to state to the House that we are anxious not to give them more trouble than is necessary, and that, therefore, we will accept the decision upon the question of adjournment as an expression of the feeling of the House upon the original question before it. We shall, therefore, not trouble the House to divide again on the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock.

Question, "That those words be there added,"—(*The Lord Advocate,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Another Amendment proposed,

To add, after the first word "That," in the original Question, the words "this House, having considered the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the Evidence taken before them, are of opinion, that, while the Evidence discloses the existence of corrupt practices, with reference to the appointment of Patrick Robert Welch to the office of Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, they are satisfied that no imputation can fairly be made against the Lord Chancellor, with regard to this appointment; and that such evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the Lords to inquire into the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Edmunds of the offices held by him, and laid before this House, show a laxity of practice and a want of caution with regard to the public interests, on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of Retiring Pensions to Public Officers against whom grave charges were pending, which, in the opinion of this House, are calculated to discredit the administration of his great office."—(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House, having considered the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the Evidence taken before them, are of opinion, that, while the Evidence discloses the existence of corrupt practices, with reference to the appointment of Patrick Robert Welch to the office of Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, they are satisfied that no imputation can fairly be made against the Lord Chancellor with regard to this appointment; and that such Evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the Lords to inquire into the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Edmunds of the offices held by him, and laid before this House, show a laxity of practice and a want of caution with regard to the public interests, on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of Retiring Pensions to Public Officers against whom grave charges were pending, which, in the opinion of this House, are calculated to discredit the administration of his great office.

AYES.

Acland, T. D.
Andover, Viscount
Angerstein, W.
Ashley, Lord
Athlumney, Lord
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Baines, E.
Baring, H. B.
Baring, rt. hn. Sir F. T.
Baring, T. G.
Beamish, F. B.
Beaumont, W. B.
Berkeley, hn. Col. F. W. F.
Berkeley, hon. C. P. F.
Biddulph, Colonel M.
Blencowe, J. G.
Bouverie, hon. P. P.
Brassey, T.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, Lord E.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Bury, Viscount
Butler, C. S.
Buxton, C.
Caird, J.
Calthorpe, hon. F. H. W. G.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Cavendish, Lord G.
Cheetham, J.
Childers, H. C. E.
Churchill, Lord A. S.
Clive, G.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Crawford, R. W.
Crossley, Sir F.
Davey, R.
Davie, Sir H. R. F
Davie, Colonel F.
Denman, hon. G.
Dodson, J. G.
Doulton, F.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, F.
Dundas, rt. hon. Sir D.
Dunkellin, Lord
Enfield, Viscount
Ewart, W.
Fermoy, Lord
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Foley, H. W.
Forster, C.
Foster, W. O.
Fortescue, hon. D. F.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gladstone, rt. hon. W.
Glyn, G. C.
Glyn, G. G.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Goschen, G. J.
Gower, G. W. G. L.
Gregory, W. H.
Grenfell, C. P.
Grenfell, H. R.
Grey, rt. hon. Sir G.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Gurney, S.
Hadfield, G.
Handley, J.
Hankey, T.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hervey, Lord A.
Hayter, rt. hn. Sir W. G.
Henderson, J.
Hodgkinson, G.
Hodgson, K. D.
Holland, E.
Horsman, rt. hon. E.
Howard, Lord E.
Ingham, R.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Johnstone, Sir J.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.
Lawrence, J. C.
Lawson, W.
Layard, A. H.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
Lysley, W. J.
Mackinnon, W. A. (Lym)
Mackinnon, W. A. (Rye)
M'Mahon, P.
Marjoribanks, D. C.
Marshall, W.
Matheson, A.
Merry, J.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moncrieff, rt. hon. J.
Monsell, rt. hon. W.
Moore, C.
Morris, W.
Neate, C.
Packe, Colonel
Padmore, R.
Paget, Lord A.
Paget, Lord C.
Palmer, Sir R.
Palmerston, Viscount

Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Pinney, Colonel
Ponsonby, hon. A.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, T. B.
Powell, J. J.
Price, R. G.
Proby, Lord
Ramsden, Sir J. W.
Robartes, T. J. A
Robertson, H.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rothschild, Baron M. de
Russell, Sir W.
St. Aubyn, J.
Salomons, Mr. Ald.
Scott, Sir W.
Scrope, G. P.
Seymour, H. D.
Seymour, A.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J. B.
Smith, M. T.
Stacpoole, W.
Stuart, Colonel C.
Tite, W.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. H.
Trelawny, Sir J. S.
Verney, Sir H.
Vernon, H. F.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vyner, R. A.
Waldegrave-Leslie, hn G
Watkin, E. W.
Weguelin, T. M.
Western, S.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
Wickham, H. W.
Winnington, Sir T. E.
Wood, rt hon. Sir C.
Woods, H.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wyvill, M.

TELLERS.

Brand, hon. H. B. W.
White, Colonel

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Adeane, H. J.
Archdall, Captain M.
Baring, T.
Barrow, W. H.
Barttelot, Colonel
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Bathurst, Colonel H.
Bentinck, G. C.
Benyon, R.
Beresford, rt. hon. W.
Beresford, D. W. Pack-
Booth, Sir R. G.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bovill, W.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Bramston, T. W.
Bremridge, R.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bulkeley, Sir R.
Burghley, Lord
Butler-Johnstone, H. A.
Cairns, Sir H. M'C.
Cartwright, Colonel
Clifford, Colonel
Clive, Capt. hon. G. W.
Collins, T.
Copeland, Mr. Ald.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Courtenay, Lord
Cranbourne, Viscount
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dawson, R. P.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dick, F.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Du Cane, C.
Duke, Sir J.
Duncombe, hon. A.
Du Pré, C. G.
Eaton, H. W.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, E. C.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D.
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Farquhar, Sir M.
Fellowes, E.
Floyer, J.
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Franklyn, G. W.
Gard, R. S.
Gilpin, Col.
Graham, Lord W.
Greenall, G.
Greene, J.
Gray, Lt.-Colonel
Grey de Wilton, Visct.
Griffith, C. D.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hardy, G.
Hardy, J.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Hennessy, J. P.
Henniker, Lord
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Heygate, Sir F. W.
Holford, R. S.
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hopwood, J. T.
Howes, E.
Humberston, P. S.
Humphery, W. H.
Ingestre, Viscount
Jolliffe, rt. hn. Sir W. G. H.
Jolliffe, H. H.
Jones, D.
Kerrison, Sir E. C.
Knatchbull, W. F.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, Colonel
Knox, hon. Major S.
Langton, W. G.
Leeke, Sir H.
Legh, Major C.
Legh, W. J.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Lennox, C. S. B. H. K.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lowther, hon. Colonel
Lowther, Captain
Lyall, G.
Lygon, hon. F.
Mainwaring, T.
Malins, R.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Miles, Sir W.
Miller, T. J.
Mills, A.
Mitford, W. T.
Montagu, Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Murray, W.
Nicol, W.
Noel, hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
North, F.
Northcote, Sir S. H.
O'Ferrall, rt. hon. R. M.
O'Neill, E.
Packe, C. W.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palk, Sir L.
Papillon, P. O.
Parker, Major W.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Peel, J.
Pennant, hon. Colonel
Percy, Earl
Peto, Sir S. M.
Pevensey, Viscount
Phillips, G. L.
Powell, F. S.
Pugh, D.
Repton, G. W. J.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rolt, J.
Rose, W. A
Rowley, hon. R. T.
Scholefield, W.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Selwyn, C. J.
Smith, A. (Herts)
Smith, A. (Truro)
Somerset, Colonel
Stanhope, J. B.
Stanhope, Lord
Stanley, Lord
Stirling, W.
Stuart, Lt.-Colonel W.
Sturt, H. G.
Sturt, Lieut.-Col. N.
Surtees, H. E.
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Thynne, Lord E.
Thynne, Lord H.
Tollemache, J.
Tomline, G.
Trefusis, hon. C. H. R.
Treherne, M.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Trollope, rt. hon. Sir J.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Vansittart, W.
Verner, E. W.
Vyse, Colonel H.
Walker, J. R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Watlington, J. W. P.
Whitmore, H.
Williams, Colonel
Wyndham, hon. H.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.

TELLERS.

Hunt, G. W.
Paull, H.

House adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 4, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee — 3rd *Report* —On Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Public Bills — *Report* — Harwich Harbour * (234); Penalties Law Amendment * (248).

Third Reading — Harwich Harbour * (234); Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) * (225); Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No 2)* (233); Penalties Law Amendment * (248).

PENSION TO MR. WINSLOW, LATE MASTER IN LUNACY.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Lord CHELMSFORD: My Lords, I wish to claim indulgence for a few minutes on a matter personal to myself. I regret to find this morning, in a report of something which occurred elsewhere last night, in answer to a question put on the subject of Mr. Winslow's pension, that my name was introduced, and it is in connection with this that I desire now to offer an explanation. The report is as follows:—

> "MR. WINSLOW'S PENSION.
>
> "Major KNOX asked the Attorney General whether it was true that a pension had been granted by the Lord Chancellor to Mr. Winslow, late one of the Masters in Lunacy? and, if so, the amount of such pension, the grounds upon which it was granted, and whether it was refused by a former Chancellor?
>
> "The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The pension granted by the present Lord Chancellor to Mr. Winslow is one of £1,000 a year, by an order made upon the 3rd of February 1863. The grounds upon which it was granted were these:—Mr. Winslow served for nearly thirty years, thirteen of which were in the office of Commissioner of Lunacy, and seventeen more as Master in Lunacy. On the 4th of February, 1859, he presented a petition to Lord Chancellor Chelmsford, stating, that he was labouring under serious permanent infirmities. That petition was supported by unexceptional certificates from two physicians and one surgeon. Mr. Winslow was obliged to resign his office owing to the presure of pecuniary difficulties. Before Lord Chancellor Chelmsford had taken that petition into consideration he left office without making any order. Therefore, according to the information I have received, it is not true, as stated by the hon. Gentleman, that any former Lord Chancellor ever refused this pension. Under the circumstances I have stated there was a delay of rather more than two years before the petition was presented to the present Lord Chancellor, and it was then supported by high testimonials, urging the propriety of Mr. Winslow's claims, from Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, Lord Justice Knight Bruce, Vice Chancellor Stuart, the Lord Chief Baron, Mr. Montague Smith, Mr. Bovill, Mr. Malins, and Mr. Commissioner Holroyd. Lord Chelmsford also wrote a letter to Mr. Commissioner Holroyd, saying, that it would give him great pleasure to see that the Lord Chancellor had taken a favourable view of Mr. Winslow's petition, and that he believed it would be gratifying to the whole profession. With these papers before him the Lord Chancellor, with the concurrence of the Law Officers of the Crown, and after deliberate consideration, granted a pension, not at the maximum of £1,200 a year, but at £1,000, or £200 less."

I need not tell your Lordships that it is with regret I enter into this subject, at what I will call a most painful moment, but it is necessary for the vindication of my own conduct that I should do so, and I trust your Lordships will listen to me for a few moments with patience. It is quite true that Mr. Winslow, formerly one of the Masters in Lunacy, was, as the Attorney General states, in pecuniary difficulties. He was afraid of coming to his office, and absented himself for a considerable time; and I also heard that he had borrowed a considerable sum of money from the keeper of a lunatic asylum. I thought this highly unbecoming and improper in a person who stood in the character of visitor of houses of that description, and I therefore desired my principal Secretary to write to him calling his attention to the fact that he had been absent for a considerable time without leave and must return to his duties, and also requesting an explanation of the circumstance to which I have already alluded. A very short time after that letter was sent, Mr. Winslow came to my room—I am happy to state that both then and on a subsequent occasion my Secretary was present — and he stated that, having served a considerable time, he was most anxious to resign his office, and hoped I would recommend him for a pension. I told him that, however painful it might be to refuse such a request, it was quite impossible for me, under the circumstances, to give any such recommendation. Mr. Winslow went away; but he came back again in about a week—the exact number of days does not signify—but he then said that he was prepared to resign his office, provided I would recommend him to a pension. I told him then most distinctly, as I had told him before, "Mr. Winslow, understand this; if you resign, you do as you please, but it must be with the perfect understanding that I cannot, and will not, recommend you to a pension." About a week after that my principal Secretary told me that he had received a petition from Mr. Winslow, desiring to resign his office on the ground of ill-health, and sending a certificate to that effect. Without looking at the petition I told my Secretary that this was clearly an afterthought, that Mr. Winslow had never contemplated resigning on the ground of ill-health, that therefore I could not look either at the petition or the certificate, and I desired them to be returned. They were returned; and Mr. Winslow resigned his office without further communication and without having been recommended for a pension. Some time afterwards—I forget whether in the time of Lord Chancellor Campbell or of the present Chancellor—Mr. Winslow wrote several letters entreating me to certify that he had retired on the ground of ill-health; but I positively refused to do so, saying that in making any such declaration I should be stating what was untrue, and therefore I could not yield to the application. Among others who communicated with me on the subject was my very old friend Mr. Commissioner Holroyd. Unfortunately the letters which Mr. Winslow wrote to me I no longer possess. About a year and a half ago I thought there could be no further occasion for them, and I threw them into the waste-paper basket; and I am not in the habit of keeping copies of my own letters. It is possible, however, that Mr. Commissioner Holroyd may have the letter which I wrote to him about the same time on the same subject. Mr. Winslow subsequently wrote to me a very earnest petition, begging that I would do anything I could to help him to get a pension, upon which I wrote a letter to Mr. Commissioner Holroyd, and to the best of my recollection what I said was that I should be very glad if the Chancellor could see any reason for granting him a pension. I certainly did not say that such a step would be gratifying to the whole profession, because I knew that the profession were very little acquainted with Mr. Winslow, who had been out of their ranks for thirty years. I hope Mr. Holroyd has my letter, for I believe that if it can be produced it will establish the accuracy of my statement. I am not now complaining that this pension has been granted, and I was, I confess, very glad to know, considering the utter ruin which might otherwise fall on Mr. Winslow and his family, that the Lord Chancellor had deemed it to be consistent with his duty to grant him a pension. I am not at all disposed to quarrel with that course being pursued, and I am simply now desirous of explaining my own position in the matter. I have been the more anxious to do this, because the office in question is that to which, on the occurrence of the vacancy, I appointed my own son-in-law, a gentleman of the highest character, and a man whom I conscientiously believe to have been perfectly competent to the performance of the duties of the office. I have been blamed for withdrawing that appointment, inasmuch the doing so seemed like admitting—but which I never can admit—that I made a wrong appointment. I do not now want to enter into the painful pressure which was put upon me on that occasion, or to speak of the determination of my son-in-law not to hold an appointment on which there could be the slightest reflection. I am only anxious to vindicate the course I pursued. I have no wish to impute blame in the matter to anybody, while I am desirous that everything connected with the granting of the pension to Mr. Winslow should, so far as I am concerned, be fully understood by the public, so that they might see that I did not only not encourage any expectation that he would receive a pension, but that I in every possible way discouraged the idea.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I do not rise to make any comments on the statement of the noble and learned Lord. He spoke of a letter which he wrote to Mr. Commissioner Holroyd. I would simply ask the permission of the House to read the letter, of which a copy has been placed in my hand since the noble and learned Lord began speaking. It is as follows:—

"July 25, 1862.

"My dear Holroyd,—It would give me very great pleasure to hear that the Chancellor had taken a favourable view of Mr. Winslow's case, and had recommended him for a pension. I was very much distressed when the position of his affairs compelled him to resign his office, and I was anxious to do everything in my power, consistently with my duty, to prevent the unfortunate necessity. After so many years' faithful service it seems hard that he should lose the retiring pension which many who have served less and not more zealously should now be enjoying. I am sure that the acknowledgment of Mr. Winslow's claim would be gratifying to the whole profession."

RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

EARL GRANVILLE: I now rise, my Lords, for another purpose. Your Lordships are aware, not only from public rumour, but officially from the proceedings of the other House of Parliament, which are communicated to us, of the Resolution with respect to the Lord Chancellor which was adopted last night in that House. It would be not only irregular but improper on my part to make any comment on that Resolution. I deem it, however, to be my duty to inform your Lordships that the Lord Chancellor requested Lord Palmerston this morning to tender to Her Majesty his resignation of the Great Seal; and that Lord Palmerston has acted upon that request. It may be interesting to your Lordships to know that the Lord Chancellor has frequently during the last five months requested Lord Palmerston to accept his resignation of his office. He stated that, though the charges against him were unjust, it might be injurious to the Government and to the profession of which he was head that he should continue to hold office with any suspicion of improper proceedings resting upon him. Lord Palmerston on those occasions induced him to withdraw his resignation, Lord Palmerston being of opinion, in which I concurred, that the Lord Chancellor should wait for the fullest Parliamentary investigation into his conduct. And now, after the fullest Parliamentary investigation that could possibly take place, I am happy to state the Resolution passed last night in the House of Commons entirely confirms the Report of the Committee of your Lordships' House and that of the Committee of the House of Commons, that no imputation of a corrupt or unworthy nature rests on the Lord Chancellor. In consequence, however, of the opinion expressed by the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston has thought it right to tender to Her Majesty the advice that the noble and learned Lord's resignation should be accepted. It would, I may add, be for the convenience of the public service that the Lord Chancellor should retain the Seals until after the prorogation of Parliament.

UNITED STATES—CLOSE OF THE CIVIL WAR.

Earl RUSSELL, having laid on the table further correspondence with respect to the war in America, took occasion to read the following extract from a letter from Mr. Seward to Sir Frederic Bruce, dated June 19, 1865:—

> "Notwithstanding, however, the exceptions and reservations which have been made by Her Majesty's Government, and which have been herein considered, the undersigned accepts with pleasure the declaration by which Her Majesty's Government have withdrawn their former concession of a belligerent character to the insurgents, and this Government further freely admits that the normal relation between the two countries being practically restored to the condition in which they stood before the civil war, the right to search British vessels has come to an end by an arrangement satisfactory in every material respect between the two nations."

PENALTIES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(No. 248.) REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Earl Granville

Lord DENMAN moved the omission of all the words in the 4th Clause except, "For any penalty not exceeding £5 two months;" also, that in 6th Clause the words "not exceeding £5" should be inserted.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY intimated that he did not hear the proposed Amendments of Lord Denman.

After a few words from Lord Chelmsford,

Lord REDESDALE said, that he retained the objection to the Bill which he stated on a previous occasion, that it would take away all discretion from the magistrates. The measure had, in his opinion, never been properly considered.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY considered the Bill to be a proper and necessary measure.

Amendment made.

Standing Orders No. 37 and 38 *considered* and *dispensed* with.

Then it was *moved*, That the Bill be now read 3ª.—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Lord DENMAN said, that as neither of his Amendments were attended to he felt compelled to divide the House against the Bill.

An Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, That "now" stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 22; Not-Contents 14: Majority 8:—*Resolved* in the *Affirmative*: Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments, and *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

CONTENTS.

Dublin, Archp.

Devonshire, D.
Somerset, D.

Lansdowne, M.

Belmore, E.
Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.

Eversley, V.

Camoys, L. [*Teller.*]
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Cranworth, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Lyveden, L.
Mostyn, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Wensleydale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Marlborough, D.

Bath, M.
Exeter, M.

De La Warr, E.
Derby, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.

Chelmsford, L.
Colchester, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Forester, L.
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]
Wentworth, L.

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN ABYSSINIA.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD CHELMSFORD, in rising to call the attention of the House to the Papers relating to the Imprisonment of British Subjects in Abyssinia, presented by command of Her Majesty, said, that a discussion had taken place elsewhere, in which great injustice had been done to Consul Cameron. In that debate circumstances were so jumbled together, facts were so misplaced, and such a mist was cast over all these transactions, that it was impossible to obtain a clear view of the circumstances; and that had been done for the purpose of exculpating the Foreign Office from the blame which attached to them, and of loading Captain Cameron with the obloquy, if he might so call it, of having been the author of his own sufferings. Mr. Layard stated that Captain Cameron was appointed Consul at Massowah, a small town on the Red Sea, and that he was directed most positively to refrain from interfering in any way whatever in the internal affairs of the country, to refrain from mixing himself up with intrigues, or attaching himself to any party in the country. He was merely to go to the King to deliver presents and then to return to Massowah, and there promote by every means in his power the trade of England with Abyssinia. The real fact was that he was accredited Consul in Abyssinia, as Mr. Plowden had been before him, and this was clearly established by the terms of the Treaty of 1849. On the 24th of July, 1860, Captain Cameron was gazetted in terms which proved that he was to act as Consul in Abyssinia. This had a most important bearing upon the case, because it was laid to the charge of Captain Cameron that he had no right at all to remain in Abyssinia after delivering the letters and presents with which he was charged, but should have returned at once to Massowah. Now, among other papers laid upon the table, were the instructions of Captain Cameron, and those instructions would satisfy their Lordships that he was not sent to Abyssinia merely to deliver presents, but was to remain there as Consul. The instructions sent him on the 2nd of February, 1861, were as follows:—

"Your first duty on arriving in Massowah, which you will consider as the head-quarter of your consulate, will be to make yourself acquainted with the general state of political affairs in Abyssinia. Her Majesty's Government are so imperfectly informed in regard to what may have happened in that country since the death of your predecessor that I am unable to lay down any very precise rules for the guidance of your conduct. The civil war which prevailed at that time may have been brought to a conclusion decidedly favourable to one or other of the contending parties, or it may still prevail with the alternate success of either. It seems to Her Majesty's Government undesirable that you should avow yourself the partizan of either of the contending parties if the contest is still going on. Whatever interest Her Majesty's Government may have in Abyssinia can best be advanced by the tranquillity of the country; but if the British agent becomes the partizan of one side, the rivalry of European interests, which, however disavowed by the Governments of Europe, is almost invariably found to exist on the part of their agents in such countries as Abyssinia, will stimulate foreign agents to declare a partizanship for the other, and thus a civil contest will be promoted and encouraged, which would otherwise die out of itself, or very shortly be brought to a conclusion by the decided preponderance of a victorious party. The principles, therefore, on which you should act are—abstinence from any course of proceeding by which a preference for either party should be imputable to you; abstinence from all intrigues to set up an exclusive British influence in Abyssinia; and, lastly, the promotion of amicable arrangements between the rival candidates for power. Her Majesty's Government are aware that religious rivalry has contributed its share to promote dissension in Abyssinia, but such rivalry should receive no countenance from a British agent, on the contrary, his study should be to extend as far as possible general toleration of all Christian sects, as being most consistent with the doctrines of Christianity and with sound policy. The British Government claim no authority to set up or advocate in a foreign country one sect of Christianity in preference to another; all that they would urge upon the rulers of any such country is to show equal favour and toleration to the professors of all Christian sects. But, although it is not desirable that you should engage in a contest with the agent of any other Power for superiority of influence, or that you should openly exhibit suspicion or jealousy of his proceedings, or of the influence which he may be supposed to have acquired, it will be your duty closely to watch any proceedings which may tend to alter the state of possession either on the sea-coast or in the interior of the country, and you will keep Her Majesty's Government at home, and Her Majesty's Governor General of India, fully informed of all matters of interest which may come under your observation, sending your despatches under flying seal in the one case through Her Majesty's agent and Consul General in Egypt, and in the other through the political agent at Aden. In addition to matters of a political or commercial nature, you will pay particular attention to any traffic in slaves which may be carried on within your district, and report fully upon the same; and you will further avail yourself of any suitable opportunity to impress upon any native rulers who may directly or indirectly encourage or permit such a traffic, the abhorrence in which it is held by the British Government, and the dislike with which any parties who may have recourse to it are likely to be regarded in this country."—[Abyssinia Papers (1) p. 1.]

How would it have been possible for Captain Cameron to have acted up to those instructions if he had been constantly resident at Massowah, which was 400 miles from Gondar, the capital of Abyssinia? Captain Cameron had also seen all the official correspondence of his predecessor, Mr. Plowden, who had been continually in Abyssinia, and had absolutely received an allowance during the last twelve years of his life for travelling expenses in that country. Captain Cameron, therefore, naturally thought he was to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor, and, acting under his instructions, remained in Abyssinia. Captain Cameron having arrived in that country in April, 1862, was unable to deliver the letters and presents to the King until October of that year, and he was then received in the most flattering manner. The King continued on amicable terms with him until March, 1863, when something occurred which induced the King to alter his conduct towards him. Now, Mr. Layard said—

> "The Consul presented Earl Russell's letter, together with the presents, to the King, and at first was well received, but presently got a strong hint to leave the country. They began by cutting his provisions short; and the King, who at first had sent his provisions from his own house, gradually diminished the supply until he was nearly starved. He was surrounded by spies, and every effort was made to induce him to leave Gondar, which, according to his instructions, he ought to have done immediately on delivering his presents."

There must be some confusion in dates in that statement, because it would appear from it that the King had endeavoured to force Captain Cameron away immediately on his arrival; whereas there was the strongest possible proof that down to the month of April, 1863, the King was on the best possible terms with him. It happened that when Captain Cameron arrived in Abyssinia the King had for a considerable time entertained a strong desire that an embassy should be sent from this country in pursuance of the Treaty of 1849. Captain Cameron, in reference to that matter, said—

> "I wrote immediately (to the King), stating that I was deputed to present him with certain gifts and a letter of introduction; also to discuss with him regarding the future; that, when Mr. Plowden was killed, there were two points under discussion—1, a treaty; 2, the sending an embassy to England. I offered to take these up where Mr. Plowden had left them."

Lord Chelmsford

Mr. Layard says—

> "Now, that was altogether contrary to the instructions he had received. So far was Consul Cameron from being instructed to propose an embassy to England from the King, that he was distinctly told that Her Majesty's Government would not entertain the idea of a mission unless he gave up all idea of conquering the Turks and invading Turkish territory. So that Consul Cameron was not justified in making such a proposal to the King."

If such instructions were ever given to Captain Cameron, why had they not been laid upon the table? But the idea that such instructions had been given was unfounded. The Emperor, in reply to Captain Cameron's letter, sent an autograph letter to this country, which was delivered to Captain Cameron for the purpose of its being forwarded to England. What did Mr. Layard say? "I have reason to think" (the hon. Gentleman never gave any reason why he thought) "that this letter was entirely got up by Captain Cameron, who wished to come to this country with an embassy." Now, there were circumstances showing that this letter had been prepared long before Captain Cameron arrived in Abyssinia. The letter was received in the Foreign Office on the 12th of February, 1863. The despatch from Captain Cameron which accompanied it was not published in the papers on the subject, but there was a reference to a despatch from Consul Cameron of the 31st of October, and no doubt this was the despatch which had come with the King's letter. On the 2nd of April, nearly two months after the receipt of the letter, a communication was sent from the Foreign Office to Consul Cameron, and yet there was not in that communication the slightest intimation that such a letter had been received. If the letter was meant as an inducement to this country to engage in a war which the King had entered into against the Turks, why could not the Government have ascertained, in a space of two months, what would be the proper answer to give to it? The letter was answered in May, 1864, fifteen months after it had been received. It would appear, however, that Mr. Layard was of opinion it never ought to have been answered, for he said—

> "A great deal has been said as to no answer having been sent to the letter from the King. I will ask any impartial person—knowing that that letter originated after a distinct understanding with the King that Her Majesty's Government would not receive a mission until he had given up alli dea of conquest upon Turkey—after re-

> jecting a treaty which authorized him to send a mission to Europe—whether any person would have thought it necessary to answer that letter at all. I can only say that even now, after what has passed, if the letter were put into my hands I should say it did not require an answer. The first letter of the King had been answered, and we did not wish that Consul Cameron should come home on a mission. Having no wish to answer that letter, we sent it to the India Office to know whether they wished to answer it. Not a bit of it. They did not think it necessary that a mission should be sent to this country, the object of which was to get us to go to war with Turkey."

He should like to know when it had been formally communicated to the King that we would not go to war with Turkey. When had a treaty been negotiated which authorized him to send a mission to Europe? He should like to know when an understanding had been come to with the King that a mission from him would not be received by Her Majesty's Government till he had given up all idea of conquest upon Turkey. He did not find any suggestion to that effect in the papers before their Lordships. He must say that, in his opinion, Mr. Layard's speech was not becoming the importance of the occasion, or the hon. Gentleman's official position. Did the noble Earl (Earl Russell) agree with him, and say that even now, after what had passed, if the letter were put into his hands, he should say it did not require an answer? The unfortunate captives had now been in prison for a period of about twenty months; but Mr. Layard threw the blame of the Consul's captivity on Consul Cameron himself. He said—

> "In this case Consul Cameron had exceeded his instructions; he might have left the country, but he mixed himself up with its affairs, and at this moment it is impossible to say why he is imprisoned; but any one who reads the papers that have been laid upon the table will see that no one is to blame for what has happened but himself."

The fact was that the King had been greatly mistaken by some publications of Mr. Stern, and other circumstances; but he contended that the greater part of the misery and mischief endured by the captives had been brought about in consequence of the King's letter not having been answered. They had one of the captives writing, "No hope of a release till a civil answer has been sent;" and what did Sir William Coghlan say?—

> "There are probably several causes for his altered demeanour towards Captain Cameron, the British Consul; one only need now be specified, but that is believed to be the chief of them: it is the long delay in replying to the letter which he addressed to Her Majesty in December, 1862, or January, 1863. It is understood that his dignity is grievously wounded by the silence, which he accepts as an affront; and this sense of injury, coupled with other circumstances, has led to the deplorable state of afairs now existing at Gondar."

He thought, therefore, he was justified in saying that the neglect to answer the letter was the principal cause of the mischief. He had always maintained that when this unfortunate fate had fallen upon these unhappy people it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to send out at the earliest period a mission, headed by an Englishman, with suitable presents to the Emperor of Abyssinia, in order to procure their release. That opinion he still maintained. Unfortunately, Mr. Rassam was appointed to this delicate mission. Mr. Layard had stated that Mr. Rassam had been misunderstood and vituperated. Certainly, however, Mr. Rassam had never been vituperated by him. What he (Lord Chelmsford) had stated on a former occasion was—

> "That Mr. Rassam had been of great assistance to Mr. Layard in his operations at Nineveh. He was the assistant to the Political Resident at Aden, and no doubt a man of great ability, and one who might well have been intrusted with any other mission than this; but the fact of his being an Asiatic, and not an European, was entirely against any hope of success."

That opinion he still entertained, and he thought that his belief was warranted by the result. Mr. Rassam arrived at Massowah; and though the Emperor knew that he had in his possession a letter addressed to himself, he had refused him an audience. He had mentioned on a former occasion that the Emperor sent two Abyssinians to see what sort of a mission was sent with Mr. Rassam. Mr. Layard, alluding to this subject, said—

> "It was said that the Emperor was displeased at the smallness of Mr. Rassam's mission. But the mission did not consist of Mr. Rassam alone; he was accompanied by a medical man and other gentlemen, and had with him a small vessel of war. So far from the Emperor having been displeased by the smallness of the mission, I have reason to believe that he was frightened by the vessel of war."

This course was a most extraordinary one to pursue. The noble Earl upon a former occasion advised them not to resort to any threats or menaces, because if that were done they might be sure that the Emperor of Abyssinia, instead of surrendering his prisoners, would wreak his anger upon his unhappy captives. Now, however, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs stated that he had reason to believe that the Emperor had been frightened by the small vessel of war. He had already shown that several persons of experience and knowledge of the country had offered to undertake the dangerous task of visiting Abyssinia, and that these offers had been made by gentlemen who entertained sanguine prospects of success. Among others he might mention the names of Dr. Beke and Sir William Coghlan, the latter of whom was a general officer. The Under Secretary of State, however, objected to a mission of this description, because if the Emperor were to seize these gentlemen and put them to death the Government would be responsible, and the Government shrunk from that responsibility. But, if there were persons generous enough to expose their lives for the sake of their fellow-creatures, he could not see why their offers should not be accepted. He was not aware what course had been pursued by the Government since Mr. Rassam had been unable to deliver this letter to the Emperor. He stated on a former occasion that, notwithstanding that the noble Earl said that it would not do to send presents to a semi-barbarous Sovereign, because it would lead to a belief on his part that presents were to be procured by ill-using foreigners, he understood that the noble Earl had sent out 500 stand of arms as a present to the Emperor. Therefore everything that ought to have been done originally that was not done had since been done. He repeated that it was an insult not to answer the letter of the King of Abyssinia for fifteen months, and the only reparation was by sending a mission, and thus endeavouring to release the captives. It was a reproach to England to allow these persons to languish in prison without using our utmost endeavours, and those pointed out by proper and experienced persons, to endeavour at least, though late, to relieve them from that misery which was mainly attributable to the noble Earl's conduct in this affair.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, the noble and learned Lord has to-night, as on a former occasion, shown himself to be entirely regardless of the safety of Consul Cameron and the other persons imprisoned by the Emperor of Abyssinia, in his solicitude, that the blame on this subject should be attributed to the conduct of the Government. Others who are also not friendly to the present Government, and who are much more intimately acquainted with the facts of the case and the character of the ruler of Abyssinia, have nevertheless abstained from pursuing the course adopted by the noble and learned Lord, feeling convinced that the case is one which ought to be dealt with by the Government of the day, and that they ought to be left at full liberty to issue such directions as they may deem expedient under the peculiar circumstances of the case. The noble and learned Lord must be perfectly aware that his reason for not disclosing on a former occasion all the information Her Majesty's Government possessed upon this matter was an anxiety to avoid taking any steps that might possibly provoke greater persecution or cruelty towards British subjects in Abyssinia. It was obvious, however, from the facts already made known that Consul Cameron had not executed the instructions which he had received from Her Majesty's Government. The noble and learned Lord had said that an entirely new policy had been adopted towards Abyssinia. [Lord CHELMSFORD dissented.] I understood the noble and learned Lord to say so; but, however, I will show him what has been done by my predecessor, Lord Clarendon. In 1849, the then ruler of Abyssinia—Ras Ali—made a treaty with this country, and it was part of that treaty that a mission should be sent from Abyssinia to this country. But in November 27, 1855, Lord Clarendon wrote to say that, though the establishment of friendly relations between the two countries would be of great advantage to both, and, though the Queen would have much pleasure in receiving a mission from the Emperor, yet it was solely on the condition that His Majesty should give a distinct assurance that he renounced all idea of conquest in Egypt and at Massowah. The noble and learned Lord says that there is no proof that the Emperor received that despatch; but, as Mr. Plowden received that despatch in 1856, and he lived there until 1860, there is every reason to believe that it was communicated to the Emperor. Ras Ali, however, was overthrown by the present King of Abyssinia. Dr. Beke, whom the noble and learned Lord represented as being exceedingly well acquainted with the affairs of Abyssinia, says of the present ruler, to whom Ras Ali had given one of his daughters to wife—

> "With great talents and energy, ambition, combined with hypocrisy, treachery, and also cruelty, is a prominent feature of his character, and he was not long in revolting against his benefactor and father-in-law."

This is the opinion of the gentleman whom the noble and learned Lord is anxious that I should send out to intercede for the captives, and I am bound to say that he is perfectly willing to go. Now, we know perfectly well that Mr. Stern, a missionary, wrote books in this country in which he gave a similar account of the King of Abyssinia, and he took two of those books to Abyssinia. His servants were cruelly tortured, and he was afterwards imprisoned, owing very much to the information given to the King that he had written these books. And yet the noble and learned Lord recommended that I should accept the generous and courageous offer of Dr. Beke, and send out a man who is almost certain to be imprisoned by the King, as the fact of these books being published is certain to be made known to the King by the enemies of this country. Consul Plowden, in one of his journeys, was taken prisoner by one of the parties in rebellion, but he was ransomed, and died soon afterwards. We were at first under the impression that the ransom had been paid by the King, but we learned afterwards that it was paid by his relatives, who had raised the sum necessary. When Captain Cameron, who had filled the office of Vice Consul, was appointed Consul, I sent him the following instructions—

> "It seems to Her Majesty's Government undesirable that you should avow yourself the partisan of either of the contending parties if the contest is still going on. Whatever interest Her Majesty's Government may have in Abyssinia can best be advanced by the tranquillity of the country; but if the British agent becomes the partisan of one side, the rivalry of European interests, which, however disavowed by the Governments of Europe, is almost invariably found to exist on the part of their agents in such countries as Abyssinia, will stimulate foreign agents to declare a partisanship for the other, and thus a civil contest will be promoted and encouraged, which would otherwise die out of itself, or very shortly be brought to a conclusion by the decided preponderance of a victorious party."—[p. 1.]

Whether the policy were bad or good, these instructions, I should think, were at least clear and intelligible. The noble and learned Lord moved for a copy of the King's letter to the Queen, which is now before your Lordships. Be it remarked that Lord Clarendon had told Consul Plowden that the Government would not sanction any proceeding by the King of Abyssinia against Egypt and the Turks. In that letter the King says—

> "My fathers the Emperors having forgotten our Creator, He handed over their kingdom to the Gallas and Turks. But God created me, lifted me out of the dust, and restored this empire to my rule. He endowed me with power, and enabled me to stand in the place of my fathers. By his power I drove away the Gallas. But for the Turks I have told them to leave the land of my ancestors. They refuse. I am now going to wrestle with them."—[p. 3.]

That is, he meant to go to war. He then goes on—

> "Mr. Plowden, and my late Grand Chamberlain, the Englishman Bell, used to tell me that there is a great Christian Queen, who loves all Christians. When they said to me this, 'We are able to make you known to her, and to establish friendship between you,' then in those times I was very glad. I gave them my love, thinking that I had found your Majesty's goodwill. All men are subject to death, and my enemies, thinking to injure me, killed these my friends. But by the power of God I have exterminated those enemies, not leaving one alive, though they were of my own family, that I may get, by the power of God, your friendship."—[p. 3.]

Now these persons—some say to the number of 300, some 800, and some 1,500—were massacred in cold blood after they had been defeated in battle and surrendered to the King. Now, was Her Majesty to be advised that the putting to death of persons in this manner was the way in which to gain Her Majesty's friendship? It was impossible for us to take any such course. I cannot imagine that the simple delay of a letter would, without other causes, account for the King's anger. Dr. Beke, speaking of the offence supposed to have been occasioned by this delay, says—

> "If it is meant that this was the first cause of offence, the correctness of such an opinion may be questioned. It is true that many months had elapsed, but the reply to the letter sent at the same time to the Emperor Napoleon had only just arrived; and had there been no other cause of dissatisfaction, Theodore would not have been so unreasonable as not to have accepted the excuse which the British Consul might easily and most reasonably have offered for the delay—namely, that while the letter to the Emperor of the French had been conveyed immediately and directly from Massowah to Egypt, the one to the Queen of England had to lie at Massowah till an opportunity presented itself of forwarding it by the roundabout way of Aden."

But we all know that the Abyssinians are most arbitrary in their notions of government; there is, therefore, no saying upon what slight ground they may have taken offence, and Her Majesty's Government plainly cannot be responsible for causes which may induce the Government of that country to imprison a British Consul. But what we do know and what we are quite certain of is that Consul Cameron, having had special directions not to interfere in the rivalries of parties in that country, did go to Gondar, and did interfere in local affairs. He says himself that he saved many lives there. But he did this by making himself a partisan, thereby disobeying the orders he had received. We did what we considered best under the circumstances. Consul Cameron himself points out that Mr. Rassam was a person of great importance in the place from which he came, next in position to the Governor, and therefore likely to be acceptable to the King of Abyssinia.

LORD CHELMSFORD: May I ask the noble Earl where the statement that he is now making is to be found?

EARL RUSSELL: If the noble and learned Lord wishes for detailed information as to all the sources of information possessed by the Foreign Office as to the character, position, and qualifications of the messengers whom they think proper to employ, the inquiry, I am afraid, will be a wide one.

LORD CHELMSFORD: I only ask for information in the particular case.

EARL RUSSELL: The information that we received satisfied us that the position of Mr. Rassam was what I have already stated. My impression is that the refusal to receive the Queen's letter—if there was an actual refusal—was owing, not to its detention, the cause to which the noble and learned Lord refers it, but to other circumstances, one of these being that the King was unable to guarantee the safety of the persons conveying the letter, nearly the whole of the country about Massowah being occupied by forces in insurrection against his authority. That would have been a very natural reason why he should have declined to guarantee the safety of the bearer. Another explanation, and the one we are inclined to adopt, is that he may have wished to get a large British force into his power in order that he might threaten to put them to death in case the Queen did not comply with his wish to take part in operations directed against Turkey. To carry on that war was avowed originally to have been his object; it was so stated in his own letter. And what would the noble and learned Lord, anxious to lay blame on Her Majesty's Government, have said if we had actually sent a large mission to the King of Abyssinia, if the members of that mission had been imprisoned, and if, in an unwholesome country, we had been obliged to undertake warlike measures with a view to accomplish their release? How powerful would then have been the declamations of the noble and learned Lord, as in the case last year of the Ashantees. I trust that a better and safer way of establishing relations with the King of Abyssinia has been adopted by Her Majesty's Government. Sir William Coghlan, whom I consulted as to the course which he thought best under the circumstances, replied that the wisest course to pursue was to wait for further advices. The probability was that either King Theodore or his enemies would be completely defeated, and in either event negotiations might be entered upon more advantageously than they could be now. As regards the presents, for the same reason, we have pursued a cautious policy. If, without any ransom being required, we hear that the captives have been set free, we shall doubtless think it right to make the King some suitable acknowledgment. We are not, at all events, going to undertake a war on behalf of the King of Abyssinia, nor on behalf of a Consul who did not follow his instructions. The matter is one, no doubt, of considerable difficulty, nor am I at all surprised that the noble and learned Lord should have taken it up, seeing how repeatedly he and his Friends have made attacks on the Government for the policy which they have pursued in reference to other countries. Noble Lords opposite, for instance, have repeatedly expressed a wish that Italy should not be united; yet that object has been in a great degree accomplished with the approval of the Government, while we had the happiness, despite the machinations of interested parties, to see the contest in America brought to a close without breaking our neutrality. I have now stated the course which the Government have deemed it to be their duty to pursue in the present instance, and I think Captain Cameron will be restored to this country.

LORD HOUGHTON said, that he was personally acquainted with Consul Cameron, and expressed his admiration of the energy of his character as well as his regret that his noble Friend who had just spoken had not deemed it right to accept the proposal of Dr. Beke, who was a man of courage, sound judgment, and practical good sense. His noble Friend had, he thought, shown too much consideration for the dangers which Dr. Beke would incur, inasmuch he was perfectly capable of duly estimating himself the nature of the perils to which he would be exposed. For his own part, he attached great value to the exertions of so experienced a traveller, and he knew no other mode in which Consul Cameron was likely to be better served. It was, of course, possible that something might be done by means of mediation with the Egyptian Government; but how to do so without implicating ourselves involved important questions of foreign policy—for we could not take an active part in the controversy on one side or the other. Consul Cameron had probably interfered with the best possible intentions, but then there was no doubt that he had acted in distinct contravention of his noble Friend's instructions. He trusted, however, that the noble Earl would not refuse to entertain further the proposed interference of Dr. Beke in the matter, for he was a person whom, he believed, might safely be intrusted with the confidential mission which he sought.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he would not follow the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to Italy, whither he could only have wandered as being the shortest cut out of Abyssinia; but he would endeavour to impress upon him that it was most important to the interest and honour of this country that these captives should be released. The mode in which that object was most likely to be effected was by communicating with the Emperor of Abyssinia; but then there must be a medium of communication, and he would urge on the noble Earl the expediency of employing Dr. Beke as the medium. He had known Dr. Beke for twenty years, and he could state that he was a most intelligent man, while he possessed the further advantage of being on excellent terms with the Emperor of Abyssinia. The noble Earl, however, seemed to think that he would be incurring a grave responsibility in acceding to the proposal which he mentioned, because of the danger to which Dr. Beke would be exposed; but when Dr. Beke was prepared to take all the responsibility on himself, the noble Earl would, he thought, by giving way to those considerations of delicacy to which he referred, be doing his duty neither to the captives nor to his country. Dr. Beke had placed in his hands a paper, in which he stated that he had not the slightest doubt he should be able to obtain the liberation of the captives, as well as to convince the Emperor of Abyssinia of the wisdom of cultivating the arts of peace in preference to those of war, and developing the immense resources of his dominion. The noble Earl, therefore, had, he thought, no more right to refuse to aid Dr. Beke in embarking on so noble a mission than a commanding officer would have to prevent a brave soldier from leading a forlorn hope. It was the duty of the Government, he contended, to protect British subjects abroad by the arm of England, and we had no right to employ men in such places that that arm could not reach them. He hoped, under those circumstances, that the noble Earl would earnestly direct his attention during the leisure time which he was about to enjoy to the liberation of the men in question.

CASE OF CATHERINE GAUGHAN.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH said, he had called attention to this case twice already. The circumstances were briefly these:—A young girl, under twenty years of age, determined to cease to be a Roman Catholic, because, as she stated, she had read the Bible. Having been urged by the priests and her friends in vain to change her resolution, she was at last subjected to the violence of a mob, who dragged her over the rugged stones by the hair. The sub-inspector of the district and three other policemen were appealed to for the protection of the girl, but they refused to interfere, and the girl was put into duress, from which she was released only by the interference of the Protestant minister, who stated in a letter that if he had not released her she would have been conveyed that night to a convent. Their Lordships might connect this case with that of Mary Ryan, who, by the connivance of the Home Secretary, had been spirited away to a foreign country. Now, he desired to inquire of Her Majesty's Government, it being true that sub-inspector Mark Burke of the Irish Constabulary having been convicted before a Bench of Magistrates in Ireland in the month of February last of a gross neglect of his duty, and in violation of his oath, in a remarkable case of cruelty and oppression inflicted on a poor female named Catherine Gaughan, and his misconduct having been laid before the Irish Administration for judgment thereon, and the Inspector General of the Irish Constabulary, having in his turn condemned the said Mark Burke, alleging against him that he had not offered a word in his defence, indicating, he added, that the accused knew how censurable his conduct had been, how it is, and at whose suggestion and influence it is, that the said Mark Burke is retained in his pay and allowances and in the public Service?

Earl GRANVILLE said, that the case had already been twice answered. He would only say, in reply to the Question that the sub-inspector had been condemned for the offence to pay a fine of £2 and to be removed from Sligo to Donegal at his own expense. Having fallen ill in Sligo, he sent in his papers and thereby tendered his resignation. It was quite true that the sub-inspector took an oath to preserve Her Majesty's peace, but he had not violated his oath, as the noble Marquess had alleged, but had been guilty of a breach of duty, for which he had been punished. The sub-inspector had been forty-one years in the service, and his superintendent certified that up to the time of the summons in this case he had exhibited the utmost fidelity and zeal in the discharge of his duties. All the details of his case had been sent to the Treasury with a view to granting him a pension for his very long services.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH said, that his charge against the sub-inspector was that, having sworn to preserve the peace, he refused to soil his fingers in doing so. He would ask, Was it not wrong to give a pension to a public servant who had so misconducted himself?

THE INDIAN ARMY.

QUESTION.

The Earl of LONGFORD rose to ask, Whether it is the intention that the Royal Commissioners recently appointed to inquire into certain matters connected with the Indian Army should be empowered to indicate the nature of the alterations which in their opinion would be desirable and practicable in the existing system? He said, he found that some Royal Commissions had been permitted, without distinct instructions, to suggest remedies for evils which they might have noticed in the course of their inquiries. For instance, the Royal Commission on Local Charges on Shipping which sat in 1863, without receiving any instruction to that effect, indicated the alterations which they thought desirable. It would be very much for the public advantage if the Royal Commission in this case would have permission to follow the same course.

Lord DUFFERIN said, that it was not intended that the Commission should indicate the nature of the alterations which they might think it desirable and practical to introduce into the existing system. Their duty would be confined to ascertaining whether the regulations as now framed carried out the intentions of the previous Commission.

THE CHURCH IN IRELAND—THE TWENTY-NINTH CANON OF 1603.

QUESTION.

The Archbishop of DUBLIN asked the Lord President of the Council, Her Majesty having graciously issued Her Licence permitting the Convocation of Canterbury to amend or repeal the Twenty-ninth Canon of the Canons of 1603, and that body having, in obedience thereto, prepared a new Canon giving permission to parents to become sponsors for their children, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to recommend Her Majesty to grant to the prelates and clergy of the Church in Ireland the like opportunity of amending or repealing the Sixteenth Canon of 1634, which is identical with the Twenty-ninth English Canon? The most rev. Prelate said that he did not for a moment imagine that the Government, by denying to the prelates and clergy of the Church of Ireland opportunities of considering this and other matters which they had permitted to the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, intended to cast any slight upon the Church in that country; but if a similar course were pursued in future the Church in Ireland might come to occupy a position altogether different from, and inferior or subordinate to, that of the sister branch of the Church in England.

Earl GRANVILLE was understood to say that the Government had no intention of reviving the action of Convocation in Ireland, in order that it might consider the Canon referred to by the most rev. Prelate, and that they were not at present advised how that body ought to be constituted, or what its powers might be.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY thought that whatever privileges were allowed to the Church in England ought to be shared by the Church in Ireland, which was an integral part of the Establishment. He was not anxious for the revival of Convocation in Ireland; but if certain privileges were conceded to the provinces of Canterbury and York they ought to be extended to those of Dublin and Armagh. It was desirable that their Lordships should learn from the highest authority what really were the powers of Convocation. The question was, how the province of Canterbury, even under licence of the Queen, had any power to impose or amend Canons, except in concurrence with the Irish branch of the Establishment. He had been told by great legal authorities that by the Act of Union the Church in Ireland and the Church in England were closely united; that they were at this moment one and indivisible; that whatever powers were conferred upon the province of Canterbury must be given to the other provinces; and that if powers were given exclusively to the province of Canterbury, whatever was done under them was of no more value than if it had passed in one of the vestries of the metropolis. He thought that before they went any further, and before the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was allowed to hold successive sittings, their Lordships and the country ought to have some clear legal statement as to what were the real powers of Convocation.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Seven o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 4, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Third Reading*—Naval Discipline Act Amendment* [*Lords*] [254]; Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment* [*Lords*] [251]; Rochdale Vicarage* [*Lords*] [252], and *passed.*

STANDING ORDERS.

Standing Orders Nos. 32 and 40 read.

MR. MILNER GIBSON moved that the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, No. 32 and No. 40, be repealed, and the following be substituted:—

Resolved, That, in cases where the work shall be situate on tidal lands within the ordinary spring tides, a Copy of the plans and sections shall, on or before the 30th day of November, be deposited at the Office of the Marine Department, Board of Trade, marked "TIDAL WATERS," and on such plans all tidal waters shall be coloured blue, and if the plans include any bridge across tidal waters, the dimensions, as regards span and headway of the nearest bridges, if any, above and below the proposed new bridge, shall be marked thereon.—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

Resolved, That, on or before the 23rd day of December, a printed Copy of every Railway and Canal Bill, and of every Bill for incorporating or giving powers to any company, shall be deposited at the office of the Board of Trade; a printed Copy of every Bill relating to any Dock, Harbour, Navigation, Pier, or Port, shall be deposited at the office of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade; and a printed Copy of every Bill relating to Turnpike Roads, at the office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

Ordered, That the said Resolutions be Standing Orders of this House.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders of this House be *printed.*

ITALY—CAPTURE OF BRITISH SUBJECTS BY BRIGANDS.—QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, without imprudence, he is able to give the House any further account of the probability of obtaining the liberation of the English gentleman who has fallen into the hands of Italian brigands?

MR. LAYARD, in reply, said, he had to state that intelligence had been received on the 29th of last month of Mr. Moens; his friends were in communication with him, and he hoped Mr. Moens would soon be out of the hands of the brigands.

PORTS OF NORTH AND SOUTH SHIELDS.—QUESTION.

SIR MATTHEW RIDLEY said, in the absence of his noble Friend (Earl Percy) he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Treasury will lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence between the Board of Customs in London and the Reports of the Collector of the Tyne relating to the severance of the Ports of North and South Shields?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER replied, that from the nature of the case there could be no objection to produce the Correspondence. He did not know if it was yet complete; but when it was complete it would be produced.

RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

Viscount PALMERSTON; Sir,—it is right I should inform the House that the Chancellor, in deference to the vote of this House last night, and the expression of opinion which that vote implied, has deemed it his duty, through me, to tender to Her Majesty the resignation of his office; which accordingly I have done. I think it, at the same time, due to the Chancellor to state that as early as the beginning of the Session—of the year I may say—the Chancellor, stung in his feelings by the various attacks which were made upon him from different quarters, often pressed upon me that his resignation should be conveyed to Her Majesty. I, upon public and upon private and personal grounds, declined to be the channel of conveying the resignation to Her Majesty; and I urged upon the Chancellor to remain in his post, for this reason—that if he had resigned in consequence of these various—some of them anonymous—attacks, he would thereby be considered as in some sort admitting the various charges which had been made, and even other charges which never had been made. I, on the other hand, represented to him that if he remained at his post there would, no doubt, be a Parliamentary inquiry into the matters alleged; and, knowing and believing his motives to be perfectly pure and incorrupt, I believed that out of that inquiry would result, as has resulted, an entire acquittal of the Chancellor of any corrupt motive. It will be necessary that he should continue to hold the Great Seal until Friday morning, in order that he may go through the proceedings and ceremonials in connection with the prorogation and dissolution of Parliament; but on Friday he will resign the seals into the hands of Her Majesty.

WEDNESDAY SITTINGS.

Sir GEORGE GREY moved, that the Standing Order, requiring the House to meet on Wednesday at Twelve, be suspended. As there was no business for to-morrow, he proposed that the House should meet *pro formâ* at four o'clock, in order to hear the Royal Assent given by Commission to several Bills.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

PRIVATE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Viscount PALMERSTON: I am sure this House would be unwilling to close the Session without recording its sense of the zeal and assiduity with which many Members have performed duties totally independent of the Public Business, and confined to the transaction of that Private Business which necessarily falls under the jurisdiction of this House. The sacrifice of the time of Members which is required, the immense labour they have to give, and the inconvenience and sometimes injury to health which is threatened by the attendance of those who are actively engaged in this portion of the business of the House of Commons, are things very little understood by the public at large; but, nevertheless, those who perform these duties are entitled to the thanks of the House and the acknowledgment of the country. There is one Gentleman in particular to whom our thanks are due—I mean the hon. Member for Walsall (Mr. Charles Forster)—who has devoted all his time, in a Session which I believe has been more productive of Private Business than almost any other of this Parliament, to the discharge of these duties. There is, also, a body recently established which has likewise performed the arduous and responsible duties which devolved upon them to the entire satisfaction of those concerned —I mean the Referees, who were appointed under this year's arrangement. I am not proposing any Vote to those Gentlemen, but I think it right to state what I believe to be the feeling of the House; and if any other hon. Member shares in those opinions I am sure it will be gratifying to the persons referred to that an acknowledgment of their services should proceed from others besides myself.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, there is no subject on which there will be a more unanimous feeling on the part of Members of this House than the appreciation of the valuable and important services rendered by those who conduct the Private Business of this House. And if there is any one point on which I differ from the noble Lord, it is only so far as to say that there is now in the public mind a more due estimate of the great labours of those Committees which do the work and conduct the Private Business which comes before this House than there was some years ago, when it was thought that the House of Commons met only for the purpose of great debates, and the public were not aware how much the business of the country depended upon the assiduity of Members who deal with the Private Business of the House. I think, therefore, that the Gentlemen who devote themselves to the Private Business of the House are entitled to our thanks; and I quite agree with the noble Lord that the manner in which the duties, both arduous and novel, of the Referees have been performed entitle them to the thanks of the House and the gratitude of the country.

Motion *agreed to.*

Standing Order as to Sittings of the House on Wednesdays read, and suspended for To-morrow.—(*Sir George Grey.*)

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS—THOMAS SWETER AND OTHERS.

PAPERS MOVED FOR.

SIR **LAWRENCE PALK**, in calling the attention of the President of the Board of Trade to the verdict of the jury at the inquest on the bodies of Thomas Sweter, George Kent, and William Anderton, and to move for Papers relating thereto, said he could not admit the proposition laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, that it was very unwise for the Legislature to interfere with the management of railways, and that it was very much better to leave the public to the remedy which the law put into their hands. The right hon. Gentleman was of opinion that the heavy damages which the railways would have to pay would be sufficient to protect the public. In that proposition he could not agree. On the contrary, that remedy would only add to the disease, for the constant imposition of heavy penalties might render the company less able to support such a number of servants and to maintain such care as might be required to prevent those accidents. In the case to which he now called attention he had the report of Captain Tyler, who stated that the accident happened chiefly from one of the engines being unfit to draw a train at the speed at which it was then going. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it would be extremely unwise and injudicious for Government to interfere in the general ordering and management of railways; but he thought the Government was bound to lay down certain rules and regulations for the safety of human life; and he could prove that such had always been the opinion of Parliament, because, for the special purposes of railways and with a view to the public safety, a Railway Department had been created in the Board of Trade. What was the use of this department if it did not make full and searching inquiry into the causes of such accidents as he was then bringing under the notice of the House? In 1864 the public feeling was so much roused in consequence of the numerous accidents which took place that a pressure was put on the Board of Trade, and they addressed a circular to the railway companies, in which they suggested various means for promoting the public safety; and, among others, that communication should be established between the passengers and the guards. A shocking death which took place had particularly stirred the public mind. A long correspondence took place between the Chairman of the Railway Clearing House and the Secretary to the Board of Trade; and, as was generally the case when a body was asked to reform itself, the railways found it impossible to carry out any of the recommendations of the Board of Trade. With regard to signals, it was worthy of consideration whether drivers and others should not undergo examination before appointment, in order to ascertain whether they suffered from colour-blindness, and whether they could distinguish between green and red. According to the right hon. Gentleman everything was to be left to the railway companies, and the Board of Trade were not to see that common precautions were taken to insure public safety. Now, when a railway paid small dividends the notorious practice was to reduce the staff with a view to economy; and he had received a letter, the writer of which said that he believed pointsmen were often eighteen hours on duty, and frequently longer. This, if true, was worthy of attention by the Board of Trade, for the lives of all who travelled by railway must be risked if they were at the mercy of men who were kept at work this length of time without rest. The frequent accidents which had taken place lately on the Great Western Railway pointed to the necessity of inquiry, which the Board of Trade ought to institute in all these cases; and if the Board of Trade had not sufficient power to interfere for the protection of the public, the right hon. Gentleman ought to call upon Parliament to give it this power. At present the railway interest, valuable as it was to the country, was a vast monopoly; and as to the influence of public opinion upon them, railway directors were quite beyond public opinion, and did not care a fig for *The Times* and the whole press of the country. When so many accidents had recently happened on one line which paid smaller dividends, and on which the officials were fewer and the men more overworked, than on any other railway of equal importance in the kingdom, it was time for the Board of Trade to interfere in the interest, not only of rich men, but of working men, whose lives were of the highest value to their families.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That there be laid before this House, Copy of any Papers relating to the inquest on the bodies of Thomas Sweter, George Kent, and William Anderton."—(*Sir Lawrence Palk.*)

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, this was a subject of great importance, but it had been treated with indifference by the House. The right hon. Gentleman, notwithstanding his humane disposition, had given extremely unsatisfactory answers, both in matter and manner, when questioned on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman generally rose with a happy smile on his countenance, and addressed himself to the subject as to which he was about to speak with a levity, which he was ready to admit was not real but apparent; therefore, if the right hon. Gentleman really deplored these disasters, and desired to prevent them, he had good ground of action against his countenance, and might recover heavy damages against it. The other day a fatal accident occurred to the tidal train from Folkestone through the maladministration of the line. The causes of these accidents were patent, and it required nothing but common care to prevent them. The railway companies were not in the position of ordinary companies, for they constituted monopolies; and yet when accidents occurred the representatives of the Board of Trade in Parliament seemed to do nothing in the matter. A few days back a question arose about locking the doors of railway carriages in consequence of an accident occurring. A railway carriage being upset, the locked door happened to be placed uppermost, the unlocked door placed against the ground. What was the use of that door being unlocked? In old times when people travelled by coaches, post-chaises, and diligences, they never heard of such things as locked doors. It happened on one occasion that a passenger fortunately had a railway-carriage key—an article which was now advertised for sale in the shops of London; but he should like to know whether it was legal to lock the passengers in the railway carriages.

Mr. WHALLEY said, it seemed to him most unjust to attack the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade. He had served with the right hon. Gentleman on a Committee, and he must say that he could not imagine any more anxious and indefatigable public servant with respect to the duties intrusted to him. He believed that the true remedy for the evils adverted to consisted in the investigations instituted by the Board of Trade with respect to accidents, and in the establishment of rules, the best which ingenuity could devise, for the safety of the public. If those rules generally approved should be disregarded, of course the penalties imposed on railway companies in the event of accidents would be commensurately heavy. However, the best remedy was competition; but during the present Session nearly £2,000,000 of capital had left this country and gone elsewhere in consequence of ordinary facilities and ordinary fairness not being extended to schemes for making new competing railway lines. With regard to the Great Western Railway, to which the hon. Member had applied strong observations, he could only say that it always appeared to him that that line was exceedingly well managed, that the officers were sufficient in number, and efficient for the duties intrusted to them, and that accidents were not more frequent on that line than on our other railways.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM believed that the very serious loss of life which had arisen from recent railway accidents might be traced to the want of three or four precautions, the observance of which should be made imperative on the companies. One great cause of these accidents proving so fatal was the insufficiency of the amount of break power employed, and he asked whether it would not be easy to enact that every train should have an amount of break power commensurate with its weight and length? Again, the officials engaged on railways were frequently overworked; and surely it might be enacted that they should not be employed more than a cetain number of hours out of the twenty-four. Another cause of the deplorable loss of life attending these catastrophes was that the rolling stock was not in an efficient and proper condition. He was led to believe that there was no inspection of rolling stock made by the Government before it was put in use. Another precaution which it was said would tend to prevent these casualties from being so fatal was that every train should have attached to each extremity three or four empty vans to break the shock in case of a collision occurring. He wished, therefore, to put it to the President of the Board of Trade whether they might not legislate on the points which he had just indicated?

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, it was not to be wondered at that the accidents which had recently occurred on railways should have produced a good deal of uneasiness in the public mind, or that they should have been taken notice of in that House. But when the hon. Member for Devizes charged him with indifference to that subject and with treating it with levity—[Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH: Only apparent levity]—he was very sorry, because his manner must be very misleading if it induced any hon. Member to suppose that he felt indifferent to such dreadful casualties as had lately taken place. He could assure his hon. Friend, if he had the opinion he had expressed, that he was labouring under an entire misapprehension. He, for one, had never laid down or accepted any rule or abstract principle that Parliament was not to interfere on behalf of the public safety; but everybody must feel that it was very difficult to say how far Parliament ought to go, or could go, with advantage to the public, in the direction of interference with the management of railway travelling. Parliament had vested certain powers in the Board of Trade, and beyond these powers of course the Department could not go. Previous to the opening of any railway they were authorized to send an Inspector who should examine into the state of the rolling stock—which was not omitted from his review, as the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Percy Wyndham) seemed to suppose; also into the condition of the permanent way; into the sufficiency of the establishment, and into the state of the telegraphs and signals and such matters; and the Inspectors was to make a Report to the Board of Trade as to whether the condition of the line was such as to justify its being opened, having regard to the safety of the public. If the Board thought that the Report of the Inspector on the whole showed an amount of danger that justified them in preventing the line from being opened, they postponed the opening for a month, and made representations to the directors as to the grounds upon which the line had been reported dangerous; and it was generally the case that before the line was opened the source of danger which had been pointed out was removed, or undoubtedly it was the duty of the Board of Trade, if the case were sufficiently strong, to continue the postponement of the opening until a remedy had been provided. Well, after the line had been opened, all they could do was to send an Inspector from time to time—"when they thought fit," were the words of the Act—to examine into the state of the permanent way, the rolling stock, and so forth. If any person made a representation—a fair representation—to them of having observed an existing cause of danger, they communicated with the company which was concerned, and they generally found—not always, but for the most part—that attention was paid to their recommendations, and they were very often followed by a remedy for the danger. In the case of the late appalling railway accidents at Rednal and Staplehurst, what could they have done more? They sent down a skilled and disinterested gentleman who inquired into all the circumstances connected with the catastrophe, and ascertained its causes. In that way, they believed that by representing to the company what had been the cause of the accident, and that if they neglected to find a remedy for the future they rendered themselves not only liable to severe penalties in a court of law, but liable also undoubtedly to the further interference of Parliament, the Department did all that was in its power. The accident to which the hon. Baronet had alluded had really arisen principally from a cause which could hardly have been foreseen. He believed it had occurred mainly—judging from Captain Tyler's Report—from the fact of a signal flag being green and being exhibited against a green background, so that the driver of the first engine did not see it. That flag was exhibited 1,100 yards before the commencement of the defective part of the permanent way, so that there was ample distance to have stopped the excursion train before it arrived on the part of the permanent way that was dangerous. But, unfortunately, the driver of the first engine passed the green flag without observing it. There were two engines to the train, and the driver of the second engine did observe it; but he had no means of communicating with the other driver. [Sir LAWRENCE PALK: Were there no means of communications between the two engine drivers?] He believed not—although the first engine-driver said he did not know why the other engine-driver did not call his attention to the signal. When the train arrived on that part of the permanent way which was under repair, the first engine went with two of its wheels off along the line for a distance of 600 yards, and there was not sufficient break power to stop it. There were, he believed, thirty-two carriages full of excursionists, and instead of holding the engine back, the carriages, in fact, acted upon it only as a propelling power. The whole train was on an incline, and therefore without a considerable break power the excursion carriages would operate to propel rather than to hold back the train. But be that as it might, he was afraid there were no regulations which Parliament or the Government could make that would secure the public entirely against such accidents. The fact was, they might make the very best regulations; but there was the important matter of compelling the observance of those regulations. And where they had so great a number of persons as it must be necessary to employ on the railway system of this country, it was not to be expected that occasionally some one servant might not fail in his duty. Those recent accidents had arisen, not entirely, but he thought to a considerable extent, rather from neglect in observing the regulations than from the absence of good regulations. However, the subject was occupying a great deal of public attention. He, for one, should be quite ready to consider any means which could be devised to allay the sense of uneasiness that appeared to prevail, which could with public advantage be proposed either to that House or to the railway companies; but, as at present advised, he certainly did not feel that that department was in a condition to come to Parliament, and ask for powers to make regulations in detail for the management of railways, and to take upon itself the responsibility for the public safety which now rested upon the companies. He had no fault to find with those who stirred up the subject in Parliament. On the contrary, he thought the bringing of it forward might be useful, because the matter was one which, he might say, caused great alarm to all minds, especially when they found that even upon a line like the South Eastern, the management of which was believed to be of the first class, they had such an awful accident as that which occurred at Staplehurst. With regard to the question put to him by the hon. Member for Devizes, as to the locking of railway carriages, if the hon. Gentleman desired to have exact information as to the law on that point, he must refer him to some better authority than he could pretend to be; but he might say he believed that there was no law to prevent his hon. Friend from using his railway key in the case he had supposed.

MR. HENLEY said, he thought that the suggestion of the hon. Member near him (Mr. Percy Wyndham), that there should be attached to each train a breakage power proportioned to the length and weight, was well deserving of consideration; but to that the right hon. Gentleman had given no answer. Proper attention ought to be given to secure the proportionate amount of break power that ought to be applied. Care ought to be taken, before trains were despatched, that the public safety should be assured. He did not know whether any definite rule could be laid down; but he hoped that during the recess the Government would consider the subject with a view to legislation. As it was, in cases of neglect the unfortunate shareholders were those who bore the punishment, but he should be glad to see those who were guilty of neglect made penally responsible.

MR. MALINS said, that one great cause of railway accidents was the want of punctuality, which put the public to very great inconvenience. Some railways were habitually unpunctual, and he would suggest that the Board of Trade should enforce punctuality. He would propose that every railway company should make a monthly return of the time that each train was behind its time; and, if necessary, the railway companies should be compelled to alter their time tables so that they might make the journeys within the specified times. It was the "hurry-scurry" which ensued in the endeavour to make up for lost time which occasioned many railway accidents. He remembered a case in which he was proceeding to Oxford, and when he arrived at the junction station he found that the train in correspondence had started. He insisted on a special train being sent on, and when it became known who he was this was done. Otherwise many persons—mostly poor people—would have been put to great inconvenience and some expense, as some of them were on their way to South Wales. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take measures to enforce the observance of time by the railway companies.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 5, 1865.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill — *Third Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).*

Royal Assent—Marriages (Lamborne) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 81]; Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 84]; Procurators (Scotland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 85]; Partnership Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 86]; General Post Office (Additional Site) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 87]; Carriers Act Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 94]; Sugar Duties and Drawbacks [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 95]; County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 99]; Record of Title (Ireland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 88]; Harbours Transfer [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 100]; Land Debentures (Ireland) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 101]; Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 82]; Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 102]; Greenwich Hospital [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 89]; Fire Brigade (Metropolis) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 90]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 91]; Ayr Burghs Election [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 92]; Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 93]; Inland Revenue [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 96]; Indemnity [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 97]; Compound Spirits Warehousing [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 98]; Admiralty, &c., Acts Repeal [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 112]; Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 121]; Clerical Subscription [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 122]; Falmouth Borough [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 103]; Crown Suits, &c. [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 144]; Poor Law Board Continuance [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 105]; Colonial Docks Loans [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 106]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 107]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 110]; Ulster Canal Transfer [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 109]; Locomotives on Roads [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 83]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 108]; Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 111], Naval Discipline Act Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 115]; Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 116]; Rochdale Vicarage [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 117]; Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1856) Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 118]; Expiring Laws Continuance [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 119]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 114]; Harwich Harbour [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 120]; Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 113].

RESIGNATION OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I have deemed it my duty, out of the deep respect I owe to your Lordships, to attend here to-day that I may in person announce to you that I tendered the resignation of my office yesterday to Her Majesty, and that it has been by Her Majesty most graciously accepted. My Lords, the step which I took yesterday only, I should have taken several months ago if I had followed the dictates of my own judgment, and acted on my own views alone. But I felt that I was not at liberty to do so. As a Member of the Government I could not take such a step without the permission and sanction of the Government. As far as I was myself personally concerned, possessing, as I had the happiness to do, the friendship of the noble Lord at the head of the Government, and of the Members of the Cabinet, I laid aside my own feelings, being satisfied that my honour and my sense of duty would be safe if I followed their opinion rather than my own. My Lords, I believe that the holder of the Great Seal ought never to be in the position of an accused person, and such, unfortunately, being the case, for my own part, I felt it due to the great office that I hold that I should retire from it and meet any accusation in the character of a private person. But my noble Friend at the head of the Government combated that view, and I think with great justice. He said it would not do to admit this as a principle of political conduct, for the consequence would be that whoever brought up an accusation would at once succeed in driving the Lord Chancellor from office. But when the charges were first raised that were investigated by a Committee of your Lordships, I did deem it my duty to press my resignation, and the answer which I then received, and to which I was obliged to assent, was that answer of my noble Friend which I have just described to you. When the Committee was appointed in the House of Commons, I deemed it to be my duty, acting upon the same principle, once more to tender my resignation; but on this occasion, also, I deferred to the objections raised by the noble Friend whom I have already mentioned. Again, when notice was given of the late Motion in the House of Commons, I begged that that Motion might be rendered unnecessary by my resignation being announced. But my noble Friend thought it was my duty still to persevere; and, accordingly, my Lords, my resignation, earnestly as I wished it to be accepted, was postponed in the manner I described to you until yesterday. Let it not be for one moment supposed that I say this in order to set up my own opinion in opposition to the kind feeling which I experienced, and the judicious advice which I received, coming, as they did, from one whom I was bound to respect, and to whose authority I felt called upon to defer. I have made this statement, my Lords, simply in the hope that you will believe, and that the public will believe that I have not clung to office, much less that I have been influenced by any baser or more unworthy motive. With regard to the opinion which the House of Commons has pronounced I do not presume to say a word. I am bound to accept the decision. I may, however, express the hope that after an interval of time calmer thoughts will prevail, and feelings more favourable to myself be entertained. I am thankful for the opportunity which my tenure of office has afforded me to propose and pass measures which have received the approbation of Parliament and which I believe, nay, I will venture to predict, will be productive of great benefit to the country. With these measures I hope my name will be associated. I regret deeply that a great measure which I had at heart—I refer to the formation of a digest of the whole law —I have been unable to inaugurate; for it was not until this Session that the means were afforded by Parliament for that purpose. That great scheme, my Lords, I bequeath to be prepared by my successor. As to the future I can only venture to promise that it will be my anxious endeavour, in the character of a private Member of your Lordships' House, to promote and assist in the accomplishment of all those reforms and improvements in the administration of justice which I feel yet remain to be carried out. I may add, in reference to the appellate jurisdiction of your Lordships' House, that I am happy to say it is left in a state which will, I think, be found to be satisfactory. There will not be at the close of the Session a single judgment in arrear, save one in which the arguments, after occupying several days, were brought to a conclusion only the day before yesterday. In the Court of Chancery I am glad to be able to inform your Lordships that I trust that by the end of this sitting there will not remain any appeal unheard or any judgment undelivered. I mention these things simply to show that it has been my earnest desire, from the moment I assumed the seals of office, to devote all the energies I possessed and all the industry of which I was capable to the public service. My Lords, it only remains for me to thank you, which I do most sincerely, for the kindness which I have uniformly received at your hands. It is very possible that by some word inadvertently used—some abruptness of manner—I may have given pain or exposed myself to your unfavourable opinion. If that be so I beg of you to accept the sincere expression of my regret, while I indulge the hope that the circumstance may be erased from your memories. I have no more to say, my Lords, except to thank you for the kindness with which you have listened to these observations.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 5, 1865.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENNESSY rose to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department of which he had given him notice privately. The Question was an important one as far as Ireland was concerned. He had mentioned the subject to the Chief Secretary, who referred him to the right hon. Baronet. The Question referred to negotiations supposed to be going on between the Government and the Irish Bishops respecting the proposal lately mentioned in the House as to the Catholic University in Ireland. In order to render the Question perfectly clear, he might mention that a Member of the Government

(Mr. Chichester Fortescue), in his address to the electors of Louth, had stated it was with the greatest satisfaction the Government found that the promoters of the Catholic University were prepared to meet the views of the Government on this matter. Rumours were afloat on the subject, and he should be glad to know how far they were well founded. He would beg to read the following extract from a letter of the Roman Catholic Archbishop, dated St. Jarlath's, Tuam, Feast of St. Peter and Paul, 1865:—

> "The rumour is utterly without foundation. The Bishops have had no deliberation on the subject. What the private opinion of individuals may be I am not aware, but, whatever may be their opinions, they are not authorized in the name of the Irish Episcopacy to treat with the Government on important subjects affecting the interests of all. Such rumours should be received with the utmost caution, for it is not likely that any body of men would attach much importance to vague Ministerial declarations on the eve of an expiring Parliament, which cannot remind the speakers of such promises, or require their fulfilment. Besides, when the foundations of sound Catholic instruction are laid by the removal of the acknowledged evils of that portion of the mixed education under the National Board, it will then be high time for us to treat with the Government on those high branches of collegiate education which they have been labouring to establish, without any reference to episcopal authority, and to the injury of the Catholic people.

He wished to know how far the statement in the address of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth is correct—whether the Government has communicated with the Irish Bishops on the subject, and if they agree or disagree with the proposal which the Government has made?

SIR GEORGE GREY said, in reply, that the hon. Member had given him no notice of this question till just before he rose to put it. He had no hesitation, however, in saying that since the time when he made the statement on the part of the Government in that House, on the Motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Tralee (The O'Donoghue) he had had no formal communication with any persons on the subject of the change to be made in the Charter of the Queen's University in order to meet the views and wishes of the Roman Catholics in Ireland in relation to obtaining University degrees. He had communicated privately with the Lord Lieutenant and several friends connected with Ireland, members of the Roman Catholic Church, in order to ascertain in what manner the object could best be effected in accordance with the wishes of those which were chiefly interested; but he had had no communication, direct or indirect, formal or private, with any member of the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the subject. He had stated that the Government thought it just and reasonable that the same facilities substantially should be given to Roman Catholics in Ireland to obtain University degrees as were enjoyed by others of Her Majesty's subjects, and they were prepared to act fully in accordance with that declaration. He had advised that such a change should he made in the Charter of the Queen's University in Ireland as would accomplish the object. He might be allowed to add that the manner in which the proposal of the Government had been received by the Roman Catholic body in Ireland was entirely satisfactory.

House adjourned at Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 6, 1865.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL — *First Reading*— Protection of Female Children * [H.L.] (255).
Royal Assent — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 123]; Admiralty Powers, &c. [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 112]; Dockyard Ports Regulation [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 61]; Prisons [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 126]; Penalties Law Amendment [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 127].

PROTECTION OF FEMALE CHILDREN BILL.

A Bill to amend the Statute Ninth George the Fourth, Chapter Thirty-one, and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Victoria, Chapter One hundred, Section Twenty-nine—Was *presented* by The Lord Denman; read 1ª. (No. 255.)

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT. SPEECH OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The LORDS COMMISSIONERS — namely, The LORD PRESIDENT (Earl Granville); The LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of St. Germans); The LORD CHAMBERLAIN OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Viscount Sydney); The VISCOUNT EVERSLEY; and The LORD WENSLEYDALE—being in their robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the COMMONS being come with their Speaker, the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

Then THE LORD PRESIDENT *delivered* the SPEECH of The LORDS COMMISSIONERS as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"WE are commanded by Her Majesty to release you from further Attendance in Parliament, and at the same Time to convey to you Her Majesty's Acknowledgments for the Zeal and Assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the Discharge of your Duties in the Session now brought to a Close.

"WE are further commanded to inform you that, as the present Parliament has now so nearly lasted the Period assigned by Law for the Duration of Parliaments, that you could not enter upon another yearly Session with Advantage to the Public Interest, it is Her Majesty's Intention immediately to dissolve the present Parliament, and to issue Writs for the calling of a new one.

"BUT Her Majesty cannot take Leave of you without commanding us to express to you Her Majesty's deep Sense of the Zeal and public Spirit which, during the Six Years of your Existence as a Parliament, you have constantly displayed in the Discharge of important Functions, and tendering to you Her Majesty's warm Acknowledgment of the many good Measures which you have submitted for Her Acceptance, and which have greatly conduced to the Diminution of the public Burthens, and to the Encouragement of the Industry, to the Increase of the Wealth, and to the Promotion of the Welfare and Happiness, of Her Majesty's People.

"WE are commanded to inform you that Her Majesty's Relations with Foreign Powers are friendly and satisfactory, and She trusts that there are no Questions pending which are likely to lead to any Disturbance of the Peace of *Europe*.

"HER Majesty rejoices that the Civil War in *North America* has ended, and She trusts that the Evils caused by that long Conflict may be repaired, and that Prosperity may be restored in the States which have suffered from the Contest.

"HER Majesty regrets that the Conferences and Communications between Her Majesty's *North American* Provinces on the Subject of the Union of those Provinces in a Confederation have not yet led to a satisfactory Result. Such a Union would afford additional Strength to those Provinces, and give Facilities for many internal Improvements. Her Majesty has received gratifying Assurances of the devoted Loyalty of Her *North American* Subjects.

"HER Majesty rejoices at the continued Tranquillity and increasing Prosperity of Her *Indian* Dominions; and She trusts that the large Supply which those Territories will afford of the raw Material of Manufacturing Industry, together with the Termination of the Civil War in the United States of *North America*, will prevent the Recurrence of the Distress which long prevailed among the Manufacturing Population of some of the Northern Counties.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"HER Majesty commands us to convey to you Her warm Acknowledgments for the liberal Supplies which you have granted to Her Majesty for the Service of the present Year, and towards the permanent Defence of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Arsenals.

"THE Commercial Treaty which Her Majesty has recently concluded with *Prussia* and the other States, composing the *German* Commercial Union, has, by Her Majesty's Commands, been laid before you. Her Majesty trusts that this Treaty will contribute to the Development of Commercial Relations between this Country and *Germany*, and will promote the Interests of the several Countries which are Parties to it.

"HER Majesty commands us to assure you that Her Attention will continue to be directed to all such Measures as may be calculated to extend and to place on a sound Footing the Trade between Her Majesty's Dominions and Foreign Countries.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"HER Majesty has given Her cordial Assent to many Measures of public Usefulness, the Result of your Labours in the Session now brought to a Close.

"THE Act for rendering the Expenses incurred for the Support of the Poor chargeable upon the whole of a Union, instead of being confined to separate Parishes, will diminish the Hardship inflicted upon the Labouring Poor by reason of Removals from Parish to Parish.

"THE Partnership Amendment Act will tend to encourage the profitable Employment of Capital.

"THE Courts of Justice Building and Concentration Acts will, it is hoped, lessen the Expense and shorten the Duration of legal Proceedings.

"THE Clerical Subscription Act, founded on the Recommendation of a Royal Commission, will remove Objections which have been felt to the Number and Variety of the Forms of Subscription and Declaration hitherto required of the Clergy.

"THE Management and Discipline of Prisons will be improved by the Act for the Consolidation and Amendment of the Laws on that Subject.

"THE County Court Equitable Jurisdiction Act will give a useful Extenison to the local Administration of Justice.

"THE Act for consolidating the Comptrollership of the Exchequer with the Board of Audit will tend to increase the Efficiency of the Arrangements for auditing the Public Accounts.

"THE Act for establishing the Record of Titles in *Ireland* will render more easy and secure the Transfer of Land

"THE Act for amending the Laws which govern the Constabulary Force in *Ireland* will tend to prevent the Recurrence of such Disorders as happened last Year at *Belfast.*

"THE Colonial Naval Defence Act has removed Restrictions which have hitherto prevented the Colonies from taking effectual Measures for their own Defence against Attacks by Sea.

"HER Majesty has also gladly given Her Assent to many other useful Measures of less general Importance.

"The Electors of the United Kingdom will soon be called upon again to choose their Representatives in Parliament; and Her Majesty fervently prays that the Blessing of Almighty God may attend their Proceedings, and may guide them towards the Attainment of the Object of Her Majesty's constant Solicitude — the Welfare and Happiness of Her People."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD PRESIDENT said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday* the Twelfth Day of *July* instant, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday* the Twelfth Day of *July* instant.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 6, 1865.

The House met at a quarter before Twelve of the clock.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The Lords Commissioners.

The House went, and the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

And afterwards a Speech of The Lords Commissioners was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord President.

Then a Commission for Proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD PRESIDENT said—

My Lords and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Command, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday* the *Twelfth* day of *July* instant, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday* the *Twelfth* day of *July* instant.

[TABLE OF STATUTES.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1865.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 5 July 1865;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of Days on which The House Sat in the Session of 1865, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and the Day of the Week, the Hour of Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of the House, and the Average Time; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings (in Continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.134, of Session 1864)."

(*Mr. Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1865			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Feb. 7	Tu	1¾	8	45	7	0	-	-	61
„ 8	W	12	2	0	2	0	-	-	42
„ 9	Th	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	314
„ 10	F	4	10	30	6	30	-	-	325
„ 13	M	4	6	15	2	15	-	-	123
„ 14	Tu	4	7	15	3	15	-	-	90
„ 15	W	12	3	15	3	15	-	-	290
„ 16	Th	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	89
„ 17	F	4	12	0	8	0	-	-	109
„ 20	M	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	146
„ 21	T	4	10	45	6	45	-	-	83
„ 22	W	12	2	15	2	15	-	-	66
„ 23	Th	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	58
„ 24	F	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	72
„ 27	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	97
„ 28	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	59
Total...	16	- -	-	-	83	0	1	30	2,024
Mar. 1	W	2	4	30	2	30	-	-	46
„ 2	Th	4	11	0	7	0	-	-	64
„ 3	F	4	9	45	5	45	-	-	71
„ 6	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	76
„ 7	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	72
„ 8	W	12	5	30	5	30	-	-	44
„ 9	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	73
„ 10	F	4	9	30	5	30	-	-	66
„ 13	M	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	93
„ 14	Tu	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	63
„ 15	W	12	1	30	1	30	-	-	36
„ 16	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	85
„ 17	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	88
„ 20	M	4	12	15	8	0	0	15	92
„ 21	Tu	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	92
„ 22	W	12	2	45	2	45	-	-	36
„ 23	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	119
„ 24	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	97
„ 27	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	123
„ 28	Tu	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	95
„ 29	W	12	4	15	4	15	-	-	72
„ 30	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	113
„ 31	F	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	87
Total...	23	- -	-	-	165	30	14	45	1,803

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1865			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Apr. 3	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	130
„ 4	Tu	4	No House.						
„ 5	W	12	3	30	3	30	-	-	84
„ 6	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	151
„ 7	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	137
		Adjourned till Monday, 24th April.							
„ 24	M	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	123
„ 25	Tu	4	8	45	4	45	-	-	109
„ 26	W	12	5	30	5	30	-	-	61
„ 27	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	124
„ 28	F	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	73
Total...	10	- -	-	-	59	30	5	45	992
May 1	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	112
„ 2	Tu	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	92
„ 3	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	57
„ 4	Th	4	11	15	7	15	-	-	113
„ 5	F	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	79
„ 8	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	101
„ 9	Tu	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	120
„ 10	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	58
„ 11	Th	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	112
„ 12	F	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	91
„ 15	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	136
„ 16	Tu	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	90
„ 17	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	73
„ 18	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	133
„ 19	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	101
„ 22	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	124
„ 23	Tu	4	9	45	5	45	-	-	87
„ 24	W	Queen's Birthday.							
„ 25	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	143
„ 26	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	97
„ 29	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	121
„ 30	Tu	12	7	30	7	30	-	-	73
Total...	22	- -	-	-	156	55	14	0	2,113

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1865			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
June 1	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	148
„ 2	F	12	12	45	12	45	0	45	101
Adjourned till Thursday, 8th.									
„ 8	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	122
„ 9	F	12	9	0	9	0	-	-	81
„ 12	M	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	127
„ 13	Tu	12	1	15	13	15	1	15	113
„ 14	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	68
„ 15	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	109
„ 16	F	12	12	45	12	45	0	45	107
„ 19	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	142
„ 20	Tu	12	12	30	12	30	0	30	93
„ 21	W	12	4	15	4	15	-	-	52
„ 22	Th	4	12	0	8	0	-	-	66
„ 23	F	12	9	45	9	45	-	-	91
„ 26	M	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	71
„ 27	Tu	12	8	15	8	15	-	-	68
„ 28	W	12	1	0	1	0	-	-	43
„ 29	Th	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	103
„ 30	F	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	91
Total...	19	- -	-	-	161	10	13	45	1,796
1865			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
July 3	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	140
„ 4	Tu	4	6	0	2	0	-	-	82
„ 5	W	4	6	0	2	0	-	-	45
„ 6	Th	12	- Prorogation -				-	-	16
Total...	4	- -	-	-	12	15	0	15	283

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
		H.	M.	H.	M.	
February......	16	83	0	1	30	2,024
March.........	23	165	30	14	45	1,803
April	10	59	30	5	45	992
May	22	156	55	14	0	2,113
June...........	19	161	10	13	45	1,796
July	4	12	15	0	15	283
Total......	93	638	20	50	0	9,011

Average Time of Sitting, 6 Hours, 51 Minutes, and 49 $\frac{63}{93}$ Seconds.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1865.

(PARL. PAPER 0·133.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	67
Ditto—After Midnight	28
Ditto—Private Business before Midnight	9
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1865	104

BY THE QUEEN.

A PROCLAMATION,

For Dissolving the present Parliament, and declaring the Calling of another.

VICTORIA R.

WHEREAS We have thought fit, by and with the Advice of Our Privy Council, to dissolve this present Parliament, which stands prorogued to *Wednesday* the Twelfth Day of *July* instant: We do, for that End, publish this Our Royal Proclamation; and do hereby dissolve the said Parliament accordingly: And the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, and the Commissioners for Shires and Burghs, of the House of Commons, are discharged from their Meeting and Attendance on the said *Wednesday* the Twelfth Day of *July* instant: And We, being desirous and resolved, as soon as may be, to meet Our People, and to have their Advice in Parliament, do hereby make known to all Our loving subjects Our Royal Will and Pleasure to call a new Parliament: And do hereby further declare, that, with the Advice of Our Privy Council, We have given Order that Our Chancellor of that Part of Our United Kingdom called *Great Britain* and Our Chancellor of *Ireland* do respectively, upon Notice thereof, forthwith issue out Writs, in due Form and according to Law, for calling a new Parliament. And We do hereby also, by this Our Royal Proclamation under Our Great Seal of Our United Kingdom, require Writs forthwith to be issued accordingly by Our said Chancellors respectively, for causing the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, who are to serve in the said Parliament, to be duly returned to, and give their Attendance in, Our said Parliament; which Writs are to be returnable on *Tuesday* the Fifteenth Day of *August* next.

Given at Our Court at *Windsor*, this Sixth Day of *July*, in the Year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and in the Twenty-ninth Year of Our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

BY THE QUEEN.

A PROCLAMATION,

In order to the Electing and Summoning the Sixteen Peers of Scotland.

VICTORIA R.

WHEREAS We have in Our Council thought fit to declare Our Pleasure for summoning and holding a Parliament of Our United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland,* on *Tuesday* the Fifteenth Day of *August* next ensuing the Date hereof: In order, therefore, to the electing and summoning the Sixteen Peers of *Scotland* who are to sit in the House of Peers in the said Parliament, We do, by the Advice of Our Privy Council, issue forth this Our Royal Proclamation, strictly charging and commanding all the Peers of *Scotland* to assemble and meet at *Holyrood House* in *Edinburgh,* on *Friday* the Twenty-eighth Day of *July* instant, between the Hours of Twelve and Two in the Afternoon, to nominate and choose the Sixteen Peers to sit and vote in the House of Peers in the said ensuing Parliament, by open Election and Plurality of Voices of the Peers that shall be then present, and of the Proxies of such as shall be absent (such Proxies being Peers, and producing a Mandate in Writing duly signed before Witnesses, and both the Constituent and Proxy being qualified according to Law): And the Lord Clerk Register, or such Two of the Principal Clerks of the Session as shall be appointed by him to officiate in his Name, are hereby respectively required to attend such Meeting, and to administer the Oaths required by Law to be taken there by the said Peers, and to take their Votes; and immediately after such Election made and duly examined, to certify the Names of the Sixteen Peers so elected, and to sign and attest the same in the Presence of the said Peers the Electors, and return such Certificate into Our High Court of Chancery of *Great Britain:* And We do, by this Our Royal Proclamation, strictly command and require the Provost of *Edinburgh,* and all other the Magistrates of the said City, to take especial Care to preserve the Peace thereof during the Time of the said Election, and to prevent all Manner of Riots, Tumults, Disorders, and Violence whatsoever; And We strictly charge and command that this Our Royal Proclamation be duly published at the Market Cross at *Edinburgh,* and in all the County Towns of *Scotland,* Ten Days at least before the Time hereby appointed for the Meeting of the said Peers to proceed to such Election.

Witness Ourselves at *Windsor,* this Sixth Day of *July* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and in the Twenty-ninth Year of Our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE SEVENTH SESSION OF

THE EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

28° & 29° *VICT.*

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

I. AN Act to amend certain clerical Errors in the Civil Bill Courts Procedure Amendment Act (*Ireland*), 1864.

II. An Act to extend the Powers now vested in Justices of the Peace to grant Licenses to deal in Game to the Divisional Magistrates within the Police District of *Dublin* Metropolis.

III. An Act for the Protection of Inventions and Designs exhibited at certain Industrial Exhibitions in the United Kingdom.

IV. An Act to apply the Sum of One hundred and seventy-five thousand six hundred and fifty Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

V. An Act for the Incorporation of the Territories of *British Kaffraria* with the Colony of the *Cape of Good Hope.*

VI. An Act for the Protection of Inventions and Designs exhibited at the *Dublin* International Exhibition for the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

VII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of *Perth.*

VIII. An Act to amend "The Election Petitions Act, 1848," in certain Particulars.

IX. An Act to allow Affirmations or Declarations to be made instead of Oaths in all Civil and Criminal Proceedings in *Scotland.*

X. An Act to apply the Sum of Fifteen Millions out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

XI. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters.

XII. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.

XIII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands Act (*Ireland*), 1863," and the Act amending the same.

XIV. An Act to make better Provision for the Naval Defence of the Colonies.

XV. An Act to extend the Term for granting fresh Letters Patent for the High Courts in *India*, and to make further Provision respecting the Territorial Jurisdiction of the said Courts.

XVI. An Act to make further Provision for the Management of the Unredeemed Public Debt in *Ireland*, and for the Reduction of the Interest payable on certain Sums advanced by the Bank of *Ireland* for the Public Service.

XVII. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the Governor General of *India* in Council at Meetings for making Laws and Regulations, and to amend the Law respecting the Territorial Limits of the several Presidencies and Lieutenant Governorships in *India.*

XVIII. An Act for amending the Law of Evidence and Practice on Criminal Trials.

XIX. An Act to extend the Period for borrowing the Sum authorized to be raised under the Metropolitan Main Drainage Extension Act, 1863.

XX. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.

XXI. An Act to amend the *Irish* Bankrupt and Insolvent Act, 1857.

XXII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the *Scottish* Herring Fisheries.

XXIII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861."

XXIV. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Bridlington, Brighouse, Burnley, Henley, Shipley, Wallingford, Llangollen, Ormskirk, Swansea, Tormoham,* and *Lockwood*.

XXV. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Derby, Ramsgate, Oswestry, Bury, Heap, Cockermouth, Matlock Bath,* and *Bromsgrove*.

XXVI. An Act to provide for Superannuation Allowances to Officers of Unions in *Ireland*.

XXVII. An Act for awarding Costs in certain Cases of Private Bills.

XXVIII. An Act to authorize certain Payments out of the Land Revenues of the Crown to provide Compensation for certain Claims in the *Isle of Man*.

XXIX. An Act for raising the Sum of One Million Pounds by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

XXX. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue.

XXXI. An Act to enable the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings to acquire additional Lands for improving the Site of the new Public Offices in *Downing Street* and the Approaches thereto.

XXXII. An Act to enable the Secretary of State in Council of *India* to acquire additional Lands for improving the Site of the *India* Office and the Approaches thereto.

XXXIII. An Act to repeal the Act of the Parliament of *Ireland* of the Sixth Year of *Anne*, Chapter Eleven, for explaining and amending the several Acts against Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees.

XXXIV. An Act to make the Metropolitan Houseless Poor Act perpetual.

XXXV. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Police Superannuation Funds in Counties and Boroughs.

XXXVI. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Registration of County Voters, and to the Powers and Duties of Revising Barristers in certain Cases.

XXXVII. An Act to make better Provision respecting the Transaction of County Business and the Administration of Justice at Quarter Sessions in the County of *Sussex;* and to confirm certain Proceedings of the Justices of the said County.

XXXVIII. An Act to authorize the Alteration of the Time for holding Statutory Meetings of Commissioners of Supply in *Scotland*.

XXXIX. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.

XL. An Act to extend to the Court of Chancery of the County Palatine of *Lancaster* certain of the Provisions of an Act passed in the Session holden in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Years of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to give to Trustees, Mortgagees and others, certain Powers now commonly inserted in Settlements, Mortgages, and Wills.*

XLI. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Sheffield, Bradford,* and *Gloucester*.

XLII. An Act for facilitating the Annexation of Tithes to District Churches.

XLIII. An Act to provide for the Security of Property of Married Women separated from their Husbands in *Ireland*.

XLIV. An Act for confirming a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862, relating to the Pilotage of the River *Tyne*.

XLV. An Act to provide for the Collection by means of Stamps of Fees payable in the Superior Courts of Law at *Westminster*, and in the Offices belonging thereto.

XLVI. An Act to suspend the making of Lists and the Ballots for the Militia of the United Kingdom.

XLVII. An Act to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in *Great Britain* and *Ireland ;* to grant Allowances in certain Cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia ; and to authorize the Employment of the Non-commissioned Officers.

XLVIII. An Act to supply Means towards defraying the Expenses of providing Courts of Justice and the various Offices belonging thereto ; and for other Purposes.

XLIX. An Act to enable the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings to acquire a Site for the Erection and Concentration of Courts of Justice, and of the various Offices belonging to the same.

L. An Act for regulating the keeping of Dogs, and for the Protection of Sheep and other Property from Dogs, in *Ireland*.

LI. An Act to enable the Admiralty to contract for certain Works in connexion with the Extension of Her Majesty's Dockyards.

LII. An Act to amend "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (*Ireland*)," and to afford further Facilities for the Purposes thereof.

LIII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863," and the Act amending the same.

LIV. An Act to alter the Days between which Pheasants may not be killed in *Ireland*.

LV. An Act to empower the University of *Oxford* to make Statutes as to the *Vinerian* Foundation in that University.

LVI. An Act to provide for the better Prevention of Trespass in *Scotland*.

LVII. An Act to amend certain Provisions in "The Ecclesiastical Leasing Act, 1858."

LVIII. An Act for confirming, with Amendments, certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Carrickfergus, Hastings, Maldon, Northam,* and *Shanklin*.

LIX. An Act for confirming, with Amendments, a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under "The Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act, 1862," relating to the Pilotage of the Port of *Sunderland.*

LX. An Act to render Owners of Dogs in *England* and *Wales* liable for Injuries to Cattle and Sheep.

LXI. An Act for providing a further Sum towards defraying the Expenses of constructing Fortifications for the Protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Ports of *Dover* and *Portland,* and of creating a Central Arsenal.

LXII. An Act to provide for the Exemption of Churches and Chapels in *Scotland* from Poor Rates.

LXIII. An Act to remove Doubts as to the Validity of Colonial Laws.

LXIV. An Act to remove Doubts respecting the Validity of certain Marriages contracted in Her Majesty's Possessions abroad.

LXV. An Act to explain "The Defence Act, 1860."

LXVI. An Act to allow the charging of the Excise Duty on Malt according to the Weight of the Grain used.

LXVII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Harbour of *Kingstown.*

LXVIII. An Act to enable the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *England* to grant Superannuation Allowances to Persons employed in their Service.

LXIX. An Act further to amend and render more effectual the Law for providing fit Houses for the Beneficed Clergy; and for other Purposes.

LXX. An Act to alter the Distribution of the Constabulary Force in *Ireland,* and to make better Provision for the Police Force in the Borough of *Belfast.*

LXXI. An Act to amend the Acts for the Establishment of a National Gallery in *Dublin.*

LXXII. An Act to make better Provision respecting Wills of Seamen and Marines of the Royal Navy and Marines.

LXXIII. An Act for regulating the Payment of Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions.

LXXIV. An Act to enable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the War Department to lay down and use a Tramway or temporary Railway across certain public Roads in the County of *Devon.*

LXXV. An Act for facilitating the more useful Application of Sewage in *Great Britain* and *Ireland.*

LXXVI. An Act for confirming, with Amendments, certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Girvan, Mevagissey,* and *Stornoway.*

LXXVII. An Act to amend the Act of the Twenty-seventh and Twenty-eighth *Victoria,* Chapter Sixty-four, commonly called "The Public House Closing Act, 1864."

LXXVIII. An Act to enable certain Companies to issue Mortgage Debentures founded on Securities upon or affecting Land, and to make Provision for the Registration of such Mortgage Debentures and Securities.

LXXIX. An Act to provide for the better Distribution of the Charge for the Relief of the Poor in Unions.

LXXX. An Act to explain and amend "The Lunatic Asylum Act, 1853," and "The Lunacy Act Amendment Act, 1862," with reference to Counties of Towns which have Courts of Quarter Sessions, but no Recorder.

LXXXI. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease called *Saint James-the-Greater* Chapel, *Eastbury* in the Parish of *Lamborne* in the County of *Berks.*

LXXXII. An Act to amend "The Endowment and Augmentation of Small Benefices (*Ireland*) Act, 1860."

LXXXIII. An Act for further regulating the Use of Locomotives on Turnpike and other Roads for agricultural and other Purposes.

LXXXIV. An Act to amend the Prisons (*Scotland*) Administration Act, 1860, and to explain the Fifty-second and Seventy-seventh Sections of the said Act.

LXXXV. An Act to amend the Laws relating to Procurators in *Scotland.*

LXXXVI. An Act to amend the Law of Partnership.

LXXXVII. An Act to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire a Site for the Extension of the General Post Office in *St. Martin's-le-Grand,* in the City of *London.*

LXXXVIII. An Act for the recording of Titles to Land in *Ireland.*

LXXXIX. An Act to provide for the better Government of *Greenwich* Hospital, and the more beneficial Application of the Revenues thereof.

XC. An Act for the Establishment of a Fire Brigade within the Metropolis.

XCI. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the Fifteenth Year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate Arrangements for the Relief of Turnpike Trusts.

XCII. An Act to shorten the Time for the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for the *Ayr* District of Burghs.

XCIII. An Act to consolidate the Offices of Comptroller General of the Exchequer and Chairman of the Commissioners for auditing the Public Accounts; and for other Purposes.

XCIV. An Act to amend the Carriers Act.

XCV. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Duties on Sugar, and the Drawbacks on those Duties.

XCVI. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Inland Revenue.

XCVII. An Act to indemnify such Persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for Offices and Employments, and to extend the Time limited for those Purposes respectively.

XCVIII. An Act to allow *British* Compounded Spirits to be warehoused upon Drawback.

XCIX. An Act to confer on the County Courts a limited Jurisdiction in Equity.

C. An Act to transfer from the Admiralty to the Board of Trade Powers and Duties relative to certain Harbours.

CI. An Act for authorizing Transferable Debentures to be charged upon Land in *Ireland.*

CII. An Act to amend an Act of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Years of Her Majesty, for the Abatement of the Nuisance arising from the Smoke of Furnaces in *Scotland,* and an Act of the Twenty-fourth Year of Her Majesty, to amend the said Act.

CIII. An Act to provide for the Discontinuance of a separate Court of Quarter Sessions and a separate Gaol in the Borough of *Falmouth.*

CIV. An Act to amend the Procedure and Practice in Crown Suits in the Court of Exchequer at *Westminster;* and for other Purposes.

CV. An Act to continue the Poor Law Board for a limited Period.

CVI. An Act to authorize Loans in aid of the Construction of Docks in *British* Possessions.

CVII. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in *Great Britain.*

CVIII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Nottingham, Rusholme, Plymouth, Redcar, Cardiff, Kingston-upon-Hull, Guildford, Ramsgate, Ryde, Workington,* and *Oxford,* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

CIX. An Act for transferring the *Ulster* Canal to the Commissioners of Public Works in *Ireland.*

CX. An Act to confirm a certain Provisional Order under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the *Hastings* District.

CXI. An Act to regulate the Disposal of Money and Effects under the Control of the Admiralty, belonging to deceased Officers, Seamen, and Marines of the Royal Navy and Marines, and other Persons.

CXII. An Act to repeal Enactments relating to Powers of the Commissioners of the Admiralty, and to various Matters under the Control of the Admiralty.

CXIII. An Act to authorize the Payment of Retiring Pensions to Colonial Governors.

CXIV. An Act for confirming, with Amendments, certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Eastbourne, Clevedon, Herne Bay, Llandrillo,* and *Pensarn.*

CXV. An Act to amend "The Naval Discipline Act, 1864."

CXVI. An Act to explain the Foreign Jurisdiction Act.

CXVII. An Act to regulate the Appointment of a Vicar or Incumbent to the Vicarage of the Parish Church of *Rochdale* in the county of *Lancaster* and in the Diocese of *Manchester.*

CXVIII. An Act to continue and amend "The Peace Preservation (*Ireland*) Act, 1856."

CXIX. An Act for continuing various expiring Acts.

CXX. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Preservation and Improvement of *Harwich* Harbour.

CXXI. An Act to amend "The Salmon Fishery Act, 1861."

CXXII. An Act to amend the Law as to the Subscriptions and Declarations to be made and Oaths to be taken by the Clergy of the Established Church of *England* and *Ireland.*

CXXIII. An Act to apply a Sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the Year ending Thirty-first *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

CXXIV. An Act for consolidating certain Enactments relating to the Admiralty.

CXXV. An Act for the Regulation of Dockyard Ports.

CXXVI. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Prisons.

CXXVII. An Act to amend the Law relating to small Penalties.

LOCAL AND PERSONAL ACTS,

DECLARED PUBLIC,

AND TO BE JUDICIALLY NOTICED.

i. AN Act to enable the *Colne Valley and Halstead* Railway Company to increase their Capital.

ii. An Act to regulate the Mode of Valuation of the underground Pipes or Works in the City of *Glasgow* belonging to the City and Suburban Gas Company of *Glasgow*, for the Purpose of Assessment under "The *Glasgow* Police Act, 1862."

iii. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to open a new Street in *Whitechapel*, and to remove *Middle Row, Holborn*, all in the County of *Middlesex*.

iv. An Act to reduce the Capital and Borrowing Powers of the *Mistley, Thorpe, and Walton* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

v. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Brighton, Hove, and Preston* Constant Service Waterworks Company.

vi. An Act to enable the *Rossendale Union* Gas Company to raise additional Capital.

vii. An Act to dissolve the Union subsisting between the Visitors of the Lunatic Asylum for the Counties of *Leicester* and *Rutland* and the Corporation of the Borough of *Leicester*, for the Admission of Lunatic Paupers from the said Borough into the said Asylum, and to empower the said Corporation to provide a separate Asylum; and to authorize the Corporation to establish a Market for the Sale of Hay and other Commodities, in lieu of the existing Market; and to extend the Powers of the said Corporation with respect to Streets in the said Borough; and for other Purposes.

viii. An Act for making an Embankment on the South Shore of the River *Shannon* near to the City of *Limerick;* and for other Purposes.

ix. An Act for authorizing the Local Board for the District of the Borough of *Oswestry* and the Liberties thereof to provide a better Supply of Water to the District, and to complete the Sewerage of the District, and to dispose of the Sewage for Irrigation; and for other Purposes.

x. An Act to repeal an Act for making, repairing, and improving certain Roads leading to and from *Helston* in the County of *Cornwall*, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof; and for other Purposes.

xi. An Act to enable the *Ramsbottom* Gas Company to raise additional Capital.

xii. An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Bolton* to construct an Aqueduct and other Works in connexion with the intended *Wayoh* Reservoir; and to make further Provisions for the Regulation of the Borough.

xiii. An Act for better supplying with Gas the Inhabitants of *Redhill* and of certain Places in the Neighbourhood thereof in the County of *Surrey*.

xiv. An Act to enable the *South Metropolitan* Gaslight and Coke Company to purchase additional Lands; to remove a Church in the Neighbourhood of their Works; and for other Purposes relating to the Company.

xv. An Act for more effectually lighting *Folkestone* and its Neighbourhood with Gas.

xvi. An Act to incorporate the *Banbury* Water Company (Limited), and to make further Provision for the Supply of Water to the Town of *Banbury* and the Neighbourhood thereof.

xvii. An Act for better supplying with Water the Town of *Luton* in the County of *Bedford*.

xviii. An Act to enable the *Athenry and Ennis Junction* Railway Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xix. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Poole* to *Bournemouth*.

xx. An Act to authorize the Construction of new and widening and altering of existing Streets and other Works and Improvements in the Borough of *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

xxi. An Act to vest in the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company and the *Lancashire Union* Railways Company jointly certain Portions of Railway near *Blackburn*.

xxii. An Act to authorize the widening of the *Blackpool* Branch of the *Preston and Wyre* Railway; and for other Purposes.

xxiii. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Railway to be called the *Luddenden Valley* Railway; to authorize Working and other Arrangements with the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company; to enable that Company to subscribe Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxiv. An Act for incorporating the *Fareham* Gas and Coke Company; for the Increase and Regulation of their Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxv. An Act to extend the Limits within which the *Bath* Gaslight and Coke Company are authorized to supply Gas, and to enable the Company to construct a Railway or Tramway, to erect additional Works, to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxvi. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Bristol* Waterworks Company, and for the Amendment of their existing Act.

xxvii. An Act for the Improvement and Regulation of the proposed new Town of *West Worthing* in the Parish of *Heene* in the County of *Sussex*.

xxviii. An Act to incorporate the *Exmouth* Gas, Coke, and Water Company (Limited), and to make further Provision for lighting the Town of *Exmouth* and certain neighbouring Places with Gas.

xxix. An Act to enable the *Shrewsbury and North Wales* Railway Company to raise further Sums, and to divide their Shares, and to make Deviations and Alterations in their authorized Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

xxx. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the *East and West India* Dock Company.

xxxi. An Act to authorize the *Metropolitan and Saint John's Wood* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Hampstead;* and for other Purposes.

xxxii. An Act to enable "The *Crystal Palace District* Gas Company" to raise additional Capital.

xxxiii. An Act to enable the Corporation of *Bristol* to improve the River *Avon* and the Docks of *Bristol.*

xxxiv. An Act for better supplying with Water the Borough of *Saint Alban* and the Parishes and Places of *Saint Albans, Saint Peter, Saint Michael, Saint Stephen, and Saundridge,* all in the County of *Hertford.*

xxxv. An Act for enabling the *Tyldesley with Shakerley* Local Board to supply Gas in their District, and in adjoining Places; and for other Purposes.

xxxvi. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Chesterfield* Waterworks and Gaslight Company.

xxxvii. An Act to authorize the *Carmarthen and Cardigan* Railway Company to form into separate Capitals the Capitals authorized to be raised by the *Carmarthen and Cardigan* Railway Acts, 1862 and 1863; and to extend the Times granted by the said Acts for the Purchase of Lands and Execution of Works.

xxxviii. An Act for the Supply of the City of *Winchester* and its Neighbourhood with Water and with Gas, and for incorporating into One Company The *Winchester* Waterworks Company (Limited) and The *Winchester* Gaslight and Coke Company.

xxxix. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Lostwithiel and Fowey* Railway Company in relation to their Capital, and for other Purposes.

xl. An Act to define the Capital of the *Midland Great Western* Railway of *Ireland* Company; to enable the Company to create Preference Shares; and for other Purposes.

xli. An Act for enabling the *Buckfastleigh, Totnes, and South Devon* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Ashburton;* and for other Purposes.

xlii. An Act to confirm an Agreement between the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company and the *Devon and Somerset* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xliii. An Act to enable the *Great Southern and Western* Railway Company to create Debenture Stock.

xliv. An Act to enable the *Kington and Eardisley* Railway Company to divide their Shares, and for other Purposes.

xlv. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Stafford and Uttoxeter* Railway Company.

xlvi. An Act for enabling the Corporation for preserving and improving the Port of *Dublin* to lay down and maintain Tramways on the Quays and elsewhere at *Dublin;* for amending the Acts relating to the Corporation; and for other Purposes.

xlvii. An Act for better supplying with Water the Inhabitants of the Townships of *Runcorn, Weston,* and *Halton,* in the Parish of *Runcorn* in the County of *Chester.*

xlviii. An Act to empower the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company to contribute Funds towards and hold Shares in the Undertaking of the City of *Glasgow Union* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xlix. An Act for incorporating the *Rastrick* Gas Company, Limited, and extending their Powers; and for other Purposes.

l. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to make new Railways from *Saint Leonards* to their *Ouse Valley* and *Tunbridge Wells* and *Eastbourne* Lines, and Deviations in those Lines; and for other Purposes.

li. An Act for the Construction of Railways to connect, by means of the *Thames Tunnel,* certain Railways on the *Surrey* Side of the River *Thames* with certain Railways on the *Middlesex* Side of the said River, to be called "The *East London* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

lii. An Act for incorporating and granting other Powers to "The *Birstal* Gaslight Company."

liii. An Act to enable the *Bodmin* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *Bodmin and Wadebridge* Railway; to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

liv. An Act to incorporate a Company for better supplying with Gas *Littleborough* in the Parish of *Rochdale* in the County of *Lancaster,* and the Neighbourhood thereof; and for other Purposes.

lv. An Act for better lighting with Gas the District of *Brierley Hill,* and certain Parishes and Places adjacent thereto, in the Counties of *Stafford* and *Worcester.*

lvi. An Act to authorize the *Newport Pagnell* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Olney* in the County of *Bucks.*

lvii. An Act to re-constitute the *Preston* Gas Company; to authorize them to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

lviii. An Act to amend an Act for building a new Chapel upon *Portsmouth Common* in the Parish of *Portsea* in the County of *Southampton;* and for other Purposes.

lix. An Act to amend the "*Galway* Commissioners Waterworks Act, 1863."

lx. An Act to transfer the Statute Labour Roads in the Burgh of *Dundee* to the Commissioners of Police of the said Burgh, and to provide for the Management and Maintenance of the said Roads.

lxi. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Railway from the *Darlington* and *Barnard Castle* Branch of the *North-eastern* Railway near *Gainford* in the County of *Durham* to *Forcett* in the North Riding of the County of *York;* to authorize Working and other Arrangements with the *North-eastern* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

lxii. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to make a Railway from their *Saint Ives and March* Railway at *Somersham* to the *Ramsey* Railway at *Ramsey* in the County of *Huntingdon.*

lxiii. An Act for consolidating and amending the Acts relating to Markets and Slaughter-houses in *Glasgow,* and for other Purposes.

lxiv. An Act to incorporate the *Gosport* Gas and Coke Company, and to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the Town of *Gosport* and certain Parishes and Places in the Neighbourhood thereof; and for other Purposes.

lxv. An Act to enable the Local Board of Health for the District of the Borough of *Llanelly* to construct Waterworks, and supply their District and adjoining Places with Water; and for other Purposes.

lxvi. An Act to enable the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to make short Junction Railways to connect their existing and authorized Railways in the County of *Surrey*, and to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

lxvii. An Act to restore the Exemption of Goods loaded or unloaded on the Lands or Docks of *Robert Vyner* Esquire, Part of and adjoining to the Great Float at *Birkenhead*, from the Payment of Dock Rates on Goods to the *Mersey* Docks and Harbour Board.

lxviii. An Act to enable the *Whitehaven Junction* Railway Company to enlarge their Station Accommodation at *Whitehaven;* to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

lxix. An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the *Glasgow* Corporation Waterworks to construct a Bridge for carrying the Aqueduct from *Loch Katrine* to *Glasgow* over the River *Endrick;* to provide for the better Distribution of Water; and for other Purposes.

lxx. An Act to make better Provision respecting the Repayment of Money borrowed by the Corporation of *Sunderland*, and for other Purposes.

lxxi. An Act for authorizing the Acquisition by the *London and South-western* Railway Company and the *Devon and Somerset* Railway Company of the Undertaking and Property of the *Ilfracombe* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxii. An Act to grant various additional Powers to the *North London* Railway Company.

lxxiii. An Act to enable the Corporation of "The President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, and Members of the School for the Indigent Blind" to sell and grant Leases of the Land belonging to them, and to purchase other Land, and for otherwise enabling them the better to carry out the Purposes of the said Corporation.

lxxiv. An Act to enable the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company to make new Railways between *Kilmarnock* and *Glasgow;* and for other Purposes.

lxxv. An Act for better supplying the Township of *Horsforth* in the West Riding of the County of *York* with Water; and for other Purposes.

lxxvi. An Act for incorporating and granting other Powers to "The *Drighlington and Gildersome* Gaslight Company."

lxxvii. An Act to authorize the *Liverpool* United Gaslight Company to increase their Capital, and to purchase additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

lxxviii. An Act to extend for a further Period the Powers of the *Wexford* Harbour Embankment Company for the Completion of their Undertaking; and to amend the Acts relating to the said Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxix. An Act to amend the Provisions of the Acts relating to the Company of Proprietors of the *Stourbridge* Navigation, and to confer further Powers on that Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxx. An Act for more effectually maintaining and repairing several Roads adjoining or near to the Town of *Great Torrington* in the County of *Devon;* and for new Powers; and for other Purposes.

lxxxi. An Act for authorizing an Extension of the *Corwen and Bala* Railway; for abandoning Portions of the *Corwen and Bala* and *Bala and Dolgelly* Railways; and for other Purposes.

lxxxii. An Act to enable the *Weald of Kent* Railway Company to make a Deviation of their authorized Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxxxiii. An Act to vest the *Carmyllie* private Railway in the *Scottish North-eastern* Railway Company; Powers to that Company to take Tolls; raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxxiv. An Act to enable the *Maryport and Carlisle* Railway Company to construct "The *Derwent* Branch Railway;" to enlarge the *Bull Gill* Station; to purchase additional Lands; to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

lxxxv. An Act to empower the *Port Talbot* Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxxvi. An Act to enable the *Whitehaven, Cleator, and Egremont* Railway Company to make Branches and other Works, and to extend their Railway to *Bigrigg Moor* in the County of *Cumberland;* to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxxvii. An Act for authorizing the Construction of Railways in the County of *Northumberland*, to be called "The *Hexham and Allendale* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

lxxxviii. An Act to authorize the Construction of Docks at *King's Lynn*, and for other Purposes relating to that Undertaking.

lxxxix. An Act for authorizing "The *London and South-Western* Railway Company" to abandon the making of Lines of Railway at *Kensington* and *Hammersmith*, and to make other Lines of Railway instead thereof, and to make the "*Chiswick* Curve;" and for other Purposes.

xc. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Manchester* to construct new Streets, enlarge Markets, improve the Channel of the River *Medlock*, and to effect further Improvements in the said City; and for other Purposes.

xci. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Railway from the *South Durham and Lancashire Union* Branch of the *North-eastern* Railway at *Lartington* to *Middleton* in *Teesdale;* Working Arrangements with the *North-eastern* Railway Company; Powers to that Company to subscribe; and for other Purposes.

xcii. An Act for enabling the *Agra* and *Masterman's* Bank (Limited) to divide the original Shares of One hundred Pounds in the Capital of the Company into Two Shares of Fifty Pounds each.

xciii. An Act to extend the Time for completing the *Aylesbury and Buckingham* Railway; to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xciv. An Act to re-incorporate "The *Gomersal* Gaslight Company, Limited;" to authorize the raising of additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xcv. An Act for establishing a Cattle Market at *Market Drayton* in the County of *Salop*.

xcvi. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Belfast* Gaslight Company.

xcvii. An Act to transfer to the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company the Powers of constructing and working the *Cheddar Valley and Yatton* Railway; to extend the Time for Purchasing Lands; to authorize the Purchase of additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

xcviii. An Act for a Joint Station at *Bristol* for the *Great Western, Bristol and Exeter*, and *Midland* Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

xcix. An Act for enabling the Local Board of the Borough of *Carnarvon* to supply their District with Water.

c. An Act to enable the *London and Blackwall* Railway Company to lease their Undertaking to the *Great Eastern* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ci. An Act to authorize the *Hammersmith and City* Railway Company to alter some of the Works connected with their Railway, and to purchase additional Lands, and to lease or transfer their Undertaking to the *Great Western* and *Metropolitan* Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

cii. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make new Lines of Railway in *Surrey*, and for vesting in them Portions of Railways, and for authorizing Agreements between them and other Railway Companies, and for the raising by them of further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ciii. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make and maintain a Railway from their Main Line of Railway at *Pirbright* by *Aldershot* to *Farnham;* and for other Purposes.

civ. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make and maintain a Railway from *Bideford* to *Great Torrington;* and for other Purposes.

cv. An Act to authorize the *Great Northern* Railway Company to construct a Railway from *Hornsey* to their *Hertford, Luton,* and *Dunstable* Line near *Hertford*.

cvi. An Act for better supplying with Water the Towns of *Kidderminster, Stourport,* and *Bewdley,* and certain Parishes and Places adjacent thereto, in the County of *Worcester*.

cvii. An Act to empower the *Ventnor* Harbour Company to raise additional Capital.

cviii. An Act for more effectually paving, lighting, and improving the Town of *Ross* in the County of *Hereford,* for maintaining and providing Markets within such Town, and for supplying the same with Water; and for other Purposes.

cix. An Act for better supplying the Town of *Rhyl* and Places in the surrounding District with Water; and for other Purposes.

cx. An Act for better supplying the Town of *Gainsborough* and the Neighbourhood thereof with Water; and for other Purposes.

cxi. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to construct Branch Railways and other Works in the Counties of *Durham* and *York;* to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

cxii. An Act for supplying with Water the Burgh of *Ayr* and Places adjacent.

cxiii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for and Completion of the *Sligo* Extension of the *Enniskillen, Bundoran, and Sligo* Railway Company; and to enable the Company to raise further Money.

cxiv. An Act to enable the *Dublin and Antrim Junction* Railway Company to create Preference Shares in lieu of unissued, surrendered, and forfeited Shares; and for other Purposes.

cxv. An Act to authorize the Enlargement and Maintenance of existing Waterworks in the Township of *Glossop* in the Parish of *Glossop* in the County of *Derby,* and the Construction of new Waterworks, and to authorize the Sale of such Waterworks, and the Purchase thereof; and for other Purposes.

cxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction by the *London and Blackwall* Railway Company of Railways in the Parishes of *Stepney, Poplar,* and *Limehouse,* to be called "The *London, Blackwall, and Millwall Extension* Railway;" to authorize Agreements with other Companies with reference thereto; and for other Purposes.

cxvii. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Metropolitan* Railway Company with reference to certain Works and Lands, and to authorize the Lease or Transfer of the Undertaking of the *Hammersmith and City* Railway Company, and Arrangements with other Parties; and for other Purposes.

cxviii. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to make certain Railways in connexion with their Railways near the Metropolis, and to purchase Station Lands; and for other Purposes.

cxix. An Act to authorize the *Hastings and St. Leonards* Gas Company to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

cxx. An Act to repeal and consolidate the Acts relating to the *Exeter* Gaslight and Coke Company and the *Exeter Commercial* Gaslight and Coke Company; and to confer further Powers on the *Exeter* Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxi. An Act for reclaiming from the Sea certain Lands on and near the Eastern and South-eastern Coast of *Essex;* for making Conduits from the *North London* Main discharging Sewers to the Coast of *Essex;* for utilizing the Sewage of *North London;* and for other Purposes.

cxxii. An Act for making a Railway to connect *Brean Down* Harbour with existing Railways in the County of *Somerset;* and for other Purposes.

cxxiii. An Act to vary, extend, and consolidate the Powers of the *Northern* Assurance Company; and for other Purposes relating thereto.

cxxiv. An Act for the further Improvement of the Drainage and Navigation by the River *Witham* in the County of *Lincoln,* and for amending the Acts relating thereto; and for other Purposes.

cxxv. An Act to authorize the *North British* Railway Company to make several Railways in the Parishes of *Liberton, Lasswade,* and elsewhere, in the County of *Edinburgh;* and to have Running Powers over the *Esk Valley* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxxvi. An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the City and Borough of *Ripon* to purchase the Gasworks of the *Ripon* Gaslight Company, and to supply Gas within the said City and Borough and the Neighbourhood thereof, in the West and North Ridings of the County of *York;* and to preclude Questions as to the Style of the City and Borough, and the Name of the Corporation; and for other Purposes.

cxxvii. An Act to empower the *West Sussex Junction* Railway Company to make a Deviation from the authorized Line of their Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxxviii. An Act to repeal, and re-enact with Amendments, the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Leamington Priors* Gaslight and Coke Company; to extend the Limits of Supply thereby authorized; to authorize an increase of Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxxix. An Act for the Incorporation and better Regulation of the Affairs of the *Assam* Company.

cxxx. An Act to extend the *Kilrush and Kilkee* Railway, and to grant further Time for Completion of the Works.

cxxxi. An Act to repeal the Acts relating to the *Plymouth and Dartmoor* Railway Company; to authorize the raising of additional Capital, and Arrangements with the *South Devon* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxxii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway at *Tiverton* to the *Devon and Somerset* Railway in the Parish of *Morebath* in the County of *Devon*, and for granting certain Powers to the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company with reference thereto.

cxxxiii. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Dunblane, Doune, and Callander* Railway Company with the *Scottish Central* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxxiv. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Crieff Junction* Railway Company with the *Scottish Central* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxxv. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Railway from *Barrhead* to *Paisley*, and to improve the Railway between *Barrhead* and *Crofthead*, all in the County of *Renfrew;* and for other Purposes.

cxxxvi. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway for connecting their Main Line near *Dalmakeddar* with the *Dumfries, Lochmaben, and Lockerby Junction* Railway near *Shielhill* in the County of *Dumfries;* and for other Purposes.

cxxxvii. An Act to repeal, consolidate, and amend the Provisions of the Acts of Parliament relating to the Company of Merchants of the City of *Edinburgh;* and to enlarge the Powers of the said Company; to amend the Act relating to *Daniel Stewart's* Hospital; and for other Purposes.

cxxxviii. An Act to extend the Limits for the Supply of Water, and to authorize the building of a Town Hall, by the Local Board of Health for the District of *Merthyr Tydfil;* and for other Purposes.

cxxxix. An Act for making a Railway from the *Caledonian* Railway at *Crofthead* to *Kilmarnock*, with a Branch to *Beith*, in the Counties of *Renfrew* and *Ayr;* and for other Purposes.

cxl. An Act for the Extension of the Boundaries of the Municipal Borough and District of *Halifax*, and otherwise improving the said Borough; to amend and extend the several Powers of the Acts relating thereto; and for other Purposes.

cxli. An Act to extend the Limits of Supply of the *Neath* Water Company, and to authorize them to construct additional Works; and for other Purposes.

cxlii. An Act to enable the *Southampton* Gaslight and Coke Company to extend their Limits for the Supply of Gas, and to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxliii. An Act to enable the *Whitehaven and Furness Junction* Railway Company to make Branches and other Works, and to extend their Railway from *Millom* in the County of *Cumberland* to join the *Furness* Railway in the Parish of *Dalton* in the County of *Lancaster;* to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxliv. An Act to extend the Term and amend the Provisions of the Act relating to the *Cromford and Belper* Turnpike Road.

cxlv. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Manchester* to construct new Works in connection with their Waterworks; and for other Purposes.

cxlvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Pier in *Morecambe Bay.*

cxlvii. An Act for extending the Powers of "The *Rickmansworth, Amersham, and Chesham* Railway Company."

cxlviii. An Act for the Incorporation of the *Ham* Oyster Fishery Company, and for authorizing them to establish and maintain an Oyster Fishery near the North-east Coast of the *Isle of Sheppey* in the County of *Kent;* and for other Purposes.

cxlix. An Act for authorizing the *Okehampton* Railway Company to make and maintain Extensions of their Railway to *Bude* in the County of *Cornwall* and to *Great Torrington* in the County of *Devon* respectively, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cl. An Act to authorize the vesting in the *Great Eastern* Railway Company of the *Bishop Stortford, Dunmow, and Braintree* Railway.

cli. An Act to confer further Powers upon "The *Metropolitan District* Railway Company."

clii. An Act to give Effect to an Agreement between the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of the City of *Edinburgh* and the *North British* Railway Company with reference to the Fruit and Vegetable Market; and for the Enlargement of the *North British* Station at *Edinburgh;* and for other Purposes.

cliii. An Act to incorporate a Company for making "The *Fareham and Netley* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cliv. An Act for authorizing the *Teign Valley* Railway Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

clv. An Act for defining and consolidating the Undertaking and Mortgage Debt of "The *Bristol Port* Railway and Pier Company;" and for other Purposes.

clvi. An Act to authorize the *Cork and Limerick Direct* Railway Company to issue Preference Shares in lieu of cancelled Shares, and to create Debenture Stock; and for other Purposes.

clvii. An Act for authorizing the *Isle of Wight* Railway Company to provide and work Steam Vessels, and to provide Accommodation for Traffic thereby, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

clviii. An Act to authorize the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company to raise more Money.

clix. An Act to enable the *Mid-Wales* Railway Company to make a Railway to join the *Central Wales* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clx. An Act to amend the Provisions of the *West Bromwich* Improvement Act, 1854, and the *West Bromwich* Improvement Amendment Act, 1855.

clxi. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway to *Balerno* in the County of *Edinburgh;* and for other Purposes.

clxii. An Act for the better Management of the *Marsh* Estate of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Southampton;* and for authorizing them to establish and maintain new Markets, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

clxiii. An Act to repeal an Act passed in the Fourth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty Queen *Victoria,* intituled "An Act for repairing several Roads leading from the Town of *Barnstaple* in the County of *Devon,* and for making several new Lines of Road connected therewith," and to grant more effectual Powers in lieu thereof; to convert into Turnpike Road Portions of existing Roads; and for other Purposes.

clxiv. An Act to authorize the opening of certain new Streets in the Borough of *Belfast,* and to confer certain Powers upon a Company and the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Belfast* for such Purposes.

clxv. An Act for empowering the *Cheltenham* Waterworks Company to extend their Works and Limits of Supply, and to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

clxvi. An Act for granting certain Powers to the *Crays* Gaslight and Coke Company, Limited.

clxvii. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *General Terminus and Glasgow Harbour* Railway Company with the *Caledonian* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

clxviii. An Act to authorize the Consolidation into One Undertaking of the *Inverness and Perth Junction* and the *Inverness and Aberdeen Junction* Railways, and the Union into One Company of the Two Companies to which the said Railways respectively belong; to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the same Companies; and for other Purposes.

clxix. An Act for making a Railway from *Bonar Bridge* Railway Station at *Ardgay* in the County of *Ross* to *Brora* in the County of *Sutherland,* to be called "The *Sutherland* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

clxx. An Act to authorize the *Carmarthen and Cardigan* Railway Company to extend their Railway near *Kidwelly* in *Carmarthenshire.*

clxxi. An Act to continue the *Winchcomb* District of Turnpike Roads Trust in the County of *Gloucester;* and for other Purposes.

clxxii. An Act to enable the *Mold and Denbigh Junction* Railway Company to raise further Sums, and to divide their Shares, and to make Deviations and Alterations in their authorized Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxiii. An Act to authorize the *Bishop's Castle* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *Minsterley* Branch of the *Shrewsbury and Welshpool* Railway in *Shropshire;* and for other Purposes.

clxxiv. An Act for transferring the *New North Road* or *Parliamentary Road, Glasgow,* to the Board of Police of *Glasgow;* and for other Purposes.

clxxv. An Act for extending the Time for the Purchase of Lands and the Completion of the Railway authorized by "The *Carnarvonshire* Railway Act, 1862."

clxxvi. An Act for the Extension of the *Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay* Railway to *Farndon;* and for other Purposes.

clxxvii. An Act to authorize the *Stonehouse and Nailsworth* Railway Company to extend their Railway from *Dudbridge* to the *Great Western* Railway at *Stroud;* and for other Purposes relating to the same Company.

clxxviii. An Act for authorizing the making by the *Tottenham and Hampstead Junction* Railway Company of Lines of Railway by way of Substitution for Lines of Railway already authorized to be made by them; and for authorizing Arrangements between them and the *Great Eastern* Railway Company and the *Midland* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxix. An Act to enable the *Furness* Railway Company to construct new Lines of Railway, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

clxxx. An Act for maintaining, improving, and managing the public Roads and Bridges in the County of *Dumfries.*

clxxxi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Wolverhampton* to *Walsall,* all in the County of *Stafford.*

clxxxii. An Act to authorize the *Great Northern* Railway Company to construct a Railway in *Lincolnshire* from *Sleaford* to *Bourn.*

clxxxiii. An Act for separating for certain Purposes the Borough of *Belfast* from the County of *Antrim;* and for making better Provision respecting Contribution by the Borough towards the Expenses of the County; and for amending the Provisions of certain of the Acts relating to the Borough; and for other Purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act to authorize the *Great Eastern* Railway Company to raise a further Sum of Money, and to consolidate certain of their Preference Stocks, and to confer Powers upon the said Company with reference to *Lowestoft* Harbour; and for other Purposes.

clxxxv. An Act for making a Railway from *Presteign* in the County of *Radnor* to join the *Central Wales* Railway in the Parish of *Llangunllo,* to be called "The *Lugg Valley* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

clxxxvi. An Act to enable the *Solway Junction* Railway Company to make certain Deviations in their authorized Line; and for other Purposes.

clxxxvii. An Act to amend and enlarge the Powers and Provisions of "The *Westminster* Improvement and Incumbered Estate Act, 1861;" for winding up the Affairs of the Commission; for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and the Completion of the Improvements; Borrowing Power; and for other Purposes.

clxxxviii. An Act for amending and extending the "*Burnham* Tidal Harbour Act, 1860," and for enlarging the Powers of the *Burnham* Tidal Harbour Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxxix. An Act for better supplying with Water the Town and Borough of *Belfast* and other Places, and for altering and amending the Constitution of the Corporation of the *Belfast* Water Commissioners; and for other Purposes.

cxc. An Act to enable the *Denbigh, Ruthin, and Corwen* Railway Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxci. An Act to authorize the *Edgware, Highgate, and London* Railway Company to construct a short Line of Railway to connect their Railway with the *Tottenham and Hampstead Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxcii. An Act for making Railways from the *Hammersmith and City* Railway through *Fulham* to the North Shore of the River *Thames;* and for other Purposes.

cxciii. An Act to empower the *Lancashire Union* Railways Company to construct an Extension Line to *Saint Helens* and other Branches in the County of *Lancaster;* and for other Purposes.

cxciv. An Act to authorize the *Lynn and Sutton Bridge* Railway Company to execute certain Works at *Sutton Bridge,* and granting other Powers to the same Company.

cxcv. An Act for the Improvement of the Town of *Southport* and the Neighbourhood thereof; and for other Purposes.

cxcvi. An Act authorizing the Sale or Transfer of *Southwark Bridge.*

cxcvii. An Act to authorize the *Sunningdale and Cambridge Town* Railway Company to make new Railways, and to use Part of the Railway of the *South-eastern* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cxcviii. An Act to authorize the Transfer to the *Belfast, Holywood, and Bangor* Railway Company of the *Holywood* Branch of the *Belfast and County Down* Railway; and for other Purposes relating to such Transfer.

cxcix. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands for Part of the Undertaking of the *Sevenoaks, Maidstone, and Tunbridge* Railway Company.

cc. An Act to authorize the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Company to form a Station on the College Lands at *Glasgow,* and to subscribe to and hold Shares in the *City of Glasgow Union* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cci. An Act to authorize the *Monkland* Railways Company to make Branch Railways in the County of *Lanark;* and for other Purposes.

ccii. An Act to enable the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway for connecting their Railway with the *North British* Railway near *Edinburgh;* and for other Purposes.

cciii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway, to be called "The *Skipton and Wharfdale* Railway."

cciv. An Act for a better Water Supply to *Tunbridge Wells* and Places near thereto; and for other Purposes.

ccv. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *Ogmore Valley* Railways Company and the *Ely Valley Extension* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from the *Port Carlisle* Railway to the River *Caldew,* and thence to the Goods Lines on the Southern Side of the *Carlisle Citadel* Station; and for other Purposes.

ccvii. An Act for repairing the Road from the Guide Post below *Haddon,* out of the *Bakewell* Turnpike Road into the *Bentley and Ashbourne* Turnpike Road in the County of *Derby;* and for other Purposes.

ccviii. An Act for amending the Metropolitan Market Act, 1857; and for other Purposes.

ccix. An Act for the *Mansfield and Worksop* Turnpike Road in the Counties of *Nottingham* and *Derby.*

ccx. An Act to give Effect to an Arrangement concerning the Contribution payable under certain Enactments by certain Baronies in *Roscommon* and *Galway* and the County of the Town of *Galway* to the *Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland* Company.

ccxi. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Swansea and Aberystwith Junction* Railway Company.

ccxii. An Act for maintaining the Public Roads and Bridges in the County of *Wigtown.*

ccxiii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway across the *Firth of Forth* in connexion with the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* and *North British* Railways, and in completion of the improved Railway Route between *Edinburgh* and *Perth* across the Firth; also other Railways and Works; and for other Purposes.

ccxiv. An Act for the further improving of the Town of *Blackpool* and the rest of the Township of *Layton with Warbrick* in the County Palatine of *Lancaster,* and for other Purposes, and of which the Short Title is "*Blackpool* Improvement Act, 1865."

ccxv. An Act for continuing the Term of the Turnpike Roads from *Brimington* and *Chesterfield* in the County of *Derby* to the *High Moors* in the Parish of *Brampton* in the said County; and for other Purposes.

ccxvi. An Act to authorize the *Great Northern* Railway Company to construct certain short Lines of Railway at *Newark, Spalding, Essendine,* and *Barkstone;* and for other Purposes.

ccxvii. An Act to amalgamate the *Monkland* Railways Company with the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Company.

ccxviii. An Act to authorize the *Kidwelly and Llanelly* Canal and Tramroad Company to stop up and discontinue the Use of their Canals, and to make a Railway from *Burry Port* in the Parish of *Pembrey* to join the Mountain Branch of the *Llanelly* Railway in the Parish of *Llanarthney, Carmarthenshire,* with Branches; to change the Name of the Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxix. An Act to authorize the *West Cornwall* Railway Company to enter into Working Arrangements with other Companies, and to lease or sell their Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxx. An Act to empower the *Belfast Central* Railway Company to make a line of Railway and a Tramway, and to empower the *Belfast* Harbour Commissioners to make a Tramway; and for other Purposes.

ccxxi. An Act to empower the *Dublin Trunk Connecting* Railway Company to make Junction and Deviation Railways; and for other Purposes.

ccxxii. An Act to authorize the Construction by the *Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford* Railway Company of a Railway connecting their Railway with the *Dublin and Kingstown* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxxiii. An Act for making a Railway from *Dingwall* to *Kyle of Lochalsh,* to be called "The *Dingwall and Skye* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

ccxxiv. An Act for authorizing the *Isle of Wight* Railway Company to make additional Railways, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccxxv. An Act to enable the *Saint Clement Danes* Improvement Company to make certain Improvements in the Parish of *Saint Clement Danes* in the County of *Middlesex;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxvi. An Act to authorize the *Stourbridge* Railway Company to construct a Branch Railway to *Stourbridge,* and to raise additional Sums of Money for their original Railway and Extension Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxxvii. An Act for the better Regulation of the *Rochester* Oyster Fishery; and for other Purposes.

ccxxviii. An Act for incorporating the *Lymington* River Company, and authorizing them to make Improvements of the lower Part of the *Lymington* River in connexion with the *Lymington* Docks, and to reclaim Mud Land opposite to the Docks; and for other Purposes.

ccxxix. An Act for enabling the *Busby* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the Village of *East Kilbride* in the County of *Lanark;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxx. An Act for the Incorporation of the *Burnley* Market Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxi. An Act to revive and extend the Powers of the River *Fergus* Navigation and Embankment Company; and for authorizing the Company to embank and reclaim from the Sea other Waste Lands on the Sides of the River *Fergus* in the County of *Clare;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxii. An Act to enable the *West Cork* Railway Company to raise additional Capital; to maintain certain Portions of their Railway constructed beyond the authorized Limits; to extend the Time limited for Completion of Works; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxiii. An Act to incorporate a Company for making Railways in the County of *Worcester,* to be called the *Halesowen and Bromsgrove* Branch Railways; and for other Purposes.

ccxxxiv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making and maintaining a Railway from the *Peterston* Station of the *South Wales* Railway to *Cadoxton-juxta-Barry,* with a Branch to *Sully,* all in the County of *Glamorgan;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxv. An Act for supplying with Water the Town and Neighbourhood of *Newtown* in the County of *Montgomery.*

ccxxxvi. An Act for the extension of the *Hoylake* Railway to *New Brighton;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxvii. An Act to enable the *Sidmouth* Railway and Harbour Company to make and maintain a Branch from their authorized Railway in the Parish of *Sidmouth;* and for other Purposes.

ccxxxviii. An Act for making a Railway, to be called "The *Spilsby and Firsby* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

ccxxxix. An Act to enable the *Swansea Vale and Neath and Brecon Junction* Railway Company to construct a Branch to *Abercrave;* and for other Purposes.

ccxl. An Act for more effectually maintaining and keeping in repair the Roads, Highways, and Bridges in the County of *Aberdeen;* for making new Roads in the said County; and for other Purposes.

ccxli. An Act to authorize the *Bishop's Castle* Railway Company to make Communications between their Railway and certain neighbouring Railways; and for other Purposes relating to their Undertaking.

ccxlii. An Act to abolish certain Restrictions as to the Use of the Connection Railways of Messieurs *Samuel Allsopp* and Sons at *Burton-upon-Trent,* and to authorize them to construct additional Railways.

ccxliii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in the Town of *Burton-upon-Trent;* and for other Purposes.

ccxliv. An Act for incorporating a Company, and for making and maintaining the *Hawes and Melmerby* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxlv. An Act to enable the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company to construct new Railways in connection with their Railways and the *Kirkcudbright* and *Bridge of Weir* Railways; and for other Purposes.

ccxlvi. An Act to enable the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company to make and maintain certain Railways in the County of *Ayr;* and for other Purposes.

ccxlvii. An Act to enable the *City of Glasgow Union* Railway Company to make Deviations of their authorized Railway; to construct a Railway to the Harbour of *Glasgow;* and for other Purposes.

ccxlviii. An Act for amalgamating the Undertaking of the *Marple New Mills and Hayfield Junction* Railway Company with that of the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company; and for authorizing the last-mentioned Company to subscribe to the Undertaking of the *Liverpool Central Station* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxlix. An Act for authorizing the Construction of a Railway from the *Great Eastern* Railway at *Mellis* to *Eye* in the County of *Suffolk;* and for other Purposes.

ccl. An Act for the Improvement and better Government of the Borough of *Newcastle-upon-Tyne;* and for other Purposes.

ccli. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to construct a Railway and Works in *Leeds* in the County of *York;* to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cclii. An Act to incorporate the Committee for managing the General Station at *Perth,* and to vest in such Committee the whole of that Station and other Works to be made Part thereof; to alter the Division and Appropriation thereof; to authorize the Enlargement and Improvement of that Station and the Construction of new Works; to enable the Committee to recover the Expense of Enlargement from the Companies interested in such Station, and to confer Powers and impose Liabilities on those Companies; and for other Purposes.

ccliii. An Act to authorize the Joint Committee for managing the General Railway Station at *Perth* to lease or feu Part of the Ground within the Station Limits for an Hotel, or to erect an Hotel thereon; to enable the Companies interested in the said Station, or the Majority of them, to contribute to the Hotel; and for other Purposes.

ccliv. An Act for regulating the Police, Lighting, Draining, and Improvement of the Burgh of *Port Glasgow;* for supplying with Water the said Burgh and Places adjacent; and for other Purposes.

cclv. An Act to empower the *South Devon* Railway Company to make a Branch Railway at *Exeter,* and to confer upon them further Powers in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cclvi. An Act for incorporating the *South Northumberland* Railway Company, and authorizing them to make and maintain the *South Northumberland* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclvii. An Act to enable the *Torquay* Gas Company to increase their Capital and extend their Works; and for other Purposes.

cclviii. An Act for making a Railway from near the *Waterloo* Station of the *London and South-western* Railway to *Whitehall;* and for other Purposes.

cclix. An Act to enable the *West Riding and Grimsby* Railway Company to raise further Sums of Money; to extend the Time limited in respect of One of their authorized Branches; and for other Purposes.

cclx. An Act to enable the *Wrexham and Minera* Railway Company to make and maintain new Lines of Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxi. An Act to enable the *Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Connah's Quay;* and for other Purposes.

cclxii. An Act to stop up Part of an existing Road called *Gloucester Road,* formerly called *Hogmore Lane,* in the Parish of *Saint Mary Abbotts, Kensington,* in the County of *Middlesex,* and to vest the Site thereof in the Owners of adjoining Lands, and to make a new Road of greater Width in lieu thereof; and for other Purposes.

cclxiii. An Act for incorporating the *Bude Canal and Launceston Junction* Railway Company, and authorizing them to make and maintain the *Bude Canal and Launceston Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxiv. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from the *Waterford and Limerick* Railway at *Clonmel* to *Lismore* and *Dungarvan;* and for other Purposes.

cclxv. An Act to enable the *Dublin, Rathmines, Rathgar, Roundtown, Rathfarnham, and Rathcoole* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Blesinton* and in *Dublin;* and for other Purposes with relation to the same Railway.

cclxvi. An Act for making a Railway from the Town of *Oban* in the County of *Argyle* to the *Dunblane, Doune, and Callander* Railway near *Callander* in the County of *Perth,* with a Tramway to the Harbour of *Oban;* and for other Purposes.

cclxvii. An Act for making a new Railway Station at *Leeds* in the County of *York;* and for other Purposes.

cclxviii. An Act to provide for a Contribution by the *London and South-western* Railway Company to the Undertaking of the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company, and for the User by them of Part of that Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

cclxix. An Act to authorize the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company to make connecting Railways, and to widen Parts of their existing Railways in *Surrey,* and to acquire additional Lands; to provide for the Abandonment of a Railway authorized by the "*Crystal Palace and South London Junction* Railway Act, 1862;" and for other Purposes.

cclxx. An Act for making a Railway from *Stratford-on-Avon* to *Worcester;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxi. An Act to enable the *Mold and Denbigh Junction* Railway Company to make certain new Lines of Railway, and to abandon a Portion of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxii. An Act for making a Railway from *Scarborough* to *Whitby.*

cclxxiii. An Act for the Dissolution of the *Tooting, Merton, and Wimbledon* Railway Company, and for vesting their Undertaking, Railway, and Property in the *London and South-western* Railway Company and the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company; and for authorizing the making and maintaining of a Junction Line of Railway at *Wimbledon* between the *London and South-western* Railway and the *Tooting, Merton, and Wimbledon* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxiv. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the *Tyne* Improvement Commissioners, and to facilitate the Construction of the *Tynemouth* Docks; and for other Purposes.

cclxxv. An Act for enabling the *West Yorkshire* Railway Company to raise further Money; and for other Purposes.

cclxxvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *West Midland* Railway to the *Coleford, Monmouth, Usk, and Pontypool* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxvii. An Act to authorize the Abandonment of the *Wem* Branch of the *Cambrian* Railways Company, and a Transfer of the Company's Agreement to work the *Aberystwith and Welsh Coast* Railway to *Thomas Savin,* and a Lease of the Company's Undertaking to the said *Thomas Savin.*

cclxxviii. An Act to make further Provision for the Prevention of Accidents from Gunpowder in the River *Mersey* and in the Borough of *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxix. An Act for making a Railway from the *Deeside* Railway Extension at *Charleston of Aboyne* to the *Bridge of Gairn,* to be called "The *Aboyne and Braemar* Railway."

cclxxx. An Act for authorizing the Sale by the Assignees in Bankruptcy of the Estate and Effects of the *Bagenalstown and Wexford* Railway Company of their Line of Railway and all other their Property, together with the Rights, Powers, Authorities, and Privileges of the said Company, and for the Dissolution of the said Company.

cclxxxi. An Act for authorizing the *Monmouthshire* Railway and Canal Company to execute additional Works; to acquire the *Brecon and Abergavenny* Canal; to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes relating to the same Company.

cclxxxii. An Act for authorizing the *Sidmouth and Budleigh Salterton* Railway Company to make and maintain a Deviation of their authorized Line in the County of *Devon;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxxiii. An Act to enable the *Aberystwith and Welsh Coast* Railway Company to deviate from some of its authorized Lines; to make certain Extensions at *Portmadoc* Harbour, *Aberdovey*, and *Cerig-y-Penrhyn;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxxiv. An Act to empower the *Brecon and Llandovery Junction* Railway Company to make a Deviation of Part of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxv. An Act for the Consolidation of the Capitals and Undertakings of the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company; to enable them to raise more Money, and to construct new Lines to *Ivor* and *Dowlais*, and a Diversion of the *Cyfarthfa* Deviation; to extend the Time for the Completion of Parts of their Railways; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxvi. An Act for granting certain Powers to the *Bromley* Gas Consumers Company, Limited.

cclxxxvii. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *Scottish Central* Railway Company with the *Caledonian* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cclxxxviii. An Act to enable the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make and maintain certain Branch Railways, to supersede certain level Crossings, and to improve certain of their Stations and acquire additional Lands, in the Counties of *Renfrew*, *Lanark*, *Edinburgh*, *Dumbarton*, and *Cumberland;* and for other Purposes.

cclxxxix. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make a Railway from their Line near *Cleland* in the County of *Lanark* to their Line near *Mid-Calder* in the County of *Edinburgh*, with Branches to the Mineral Fields and Works in that District; and for other Purposes.

ccxc. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to extend their *Douglas* Branch to *Muirkirk* in the Counties of *Lanark* and *Ayr;* and for other Purposes.

ccxci. An Act to authorize the vesting of the *Aberystwith and Welsh Coast* Railway in the *Cambrian* Railways Company by Amalgamation.

ccxcii. An Act for making and maintaining the *Chester and West Cheshire Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxciii. An Act for making a Railway from *Coventry* to the *Southam* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxciv. An Act for making a Railway from the Town of *Crieff* to *Comrie*, with a Railway connecting said Railway with the authorized *Crieff and Methven Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccxcv. An Act to incorporate a Company for maintaining an existing Railway from *Carreg Hylldrem* in the County of *Merioneth* to *Portmadoc* in the County of *Carnarvon*, and making an Extension thereof.

ccxcvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways to connect *Deal* and *Walmer* and *Dover* in the County of *Kent;* and for other Purposes.

ccxcvii. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Dumfries, Lochmaben, and Lockerby Junction* Railway Company with the *Caledonian* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxcviii. An Act for the Amalgamation of divers Railway Companies with the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

ccxcix. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Great-western* Railway Company for the Construction of Works and the Acquisition of Lands, and otherwise in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies and Persons; and for other Purposes.

ccc. An Act to consolidate and amend the Provisions relating to the Police of the Town of *Greenock;* to authorize certain Improvements in the said Town; and for various other Purposes.

ccci. An Act for making Railways from *Greenock* to the *Glasgow and South-western* and *Bridge of Weir* Railways; and for other Purposes.

cccii. An Act to amend the *Highbridge* Markets and Gas Act; and for other Purposes.

ccciii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Westerfield* Station near *Ipswich* of the *Great Eastern* Railway to *Felixstow* in the County of *Suffolk;* and for other Purposes.

ccciv. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make new Works; and for the Amalgamation with their Undertaking of the Undertakings of divers Railway Companies; and for authorizing Arrangements respecting divers Railways; and for regulating and increasing the Capital and Borrowing Powers of the *London and South-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cccv. An Act to authorize the *Manchester and Milford* Railway Company to make certain new Railways in substitution for Part of their authorized Railway and *Aberystwith* Branch; and to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of Part of their authorized Line; and to give various other Powers to the said Company and to other Railway Companies; and for other Purposes.

cccvi. An Act for making a Railway from the *Cemmes Road* Station on the *Cambrian* Railway to near the Town of *Dinas Mowddwy;* and for other Purposes.

cccvii. An Act to enable the *Newry and Greenore* Railway Company to make certain Deviations in their authorized Line, and to construct certain new Works; and for other Purposes.

cccviii. An Act to provide for a complete Union of the Undertakings of the *North British* and *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Companies by Amalgamation; and for other Purposes.

cccix. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Pier at *Burntisland* and other Works by the *North British* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cccx. An Act for making Railways from the *North London* Railway to *Alexandra Park*, and to the *Edgware, Highgate, and London* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxi. An Act for defining and extending the Powers of the Corporation of *Oldham* in relation to the Improvement of Streets in the Borough, and to Police and other Matters of local Government, and to Gas and Water Supply; and for other Purposes.

cccxii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway between *Ross and Monmouth;* and for other Purposes.

cccxiii. An Act for dividing the Parish of *Saint Philip and Jacob* in the City and County of *Bristol;* and for forming the Out-Parish of *Saint Philip and Jacob* into a distinct and separate Parish; for making further Provision as to the Election and Appointment of Overseers of the Poor for the said Out-Parish, and as to Churchwardens of the said Out-Parish; and for other Purposes.

cccxiv. An Act for the making and maintaining of *Stapenhill Bridge* over the River *Trent* near to the Town of *Burton-upon-Trent*, with Approaches thereto, and for the discontinuing of *Stapenhill Ferry* across the River; and for other Purposes.

cccxv. An Act for making a Railway from near the *Aberystwith and Welsh Coast* Railway in the Parish of *Towyn* in the County of *Merioneth* to the Township of *Maestrefnant* in the Direction of *Talyllyn*, to be called "The *Talyllyn* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cccxvi. An Act for authorizing the *Vale of Neath* Railway Company to raise further Monies; and for giving Effect to Agreements between them and the *Aberdare Valley* Railway Company and the *London and North-western* Railway Company respectively; and for other Purposes.

cccxvii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from *Watchet* to *Minehead* in the County of *Somerset*.

cccxviii. An Act for making Railways in *Wiltshire* from the *London and South-western* Railway to the *Berks and Hants* Railway at *Pewsey* and *Woodborough;* and for other Purposes.

cccxix. An Act to authorize Deviations in the Line of the *Gloucester* Extension of the *Worcester, Dean Forest, and Monmouth* Railway Company; and to enable the Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cccxx. An Act for authorizing the Construction of a Railway from *Acton* to *Brentford;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxi. An Act to authorize the *West Riding and Grimsby* Railway Company to construct a Railway from the *South Yorkshire* Railway to *Lincoln;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxii. An Act for incorporating a Company for making a Railway from *Portmadoc* to *Beddgelert* in the Counties of *Carnarvon and Merioneth;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxiii. An Act to enable the *Bishop's Castle* Railway Company to make Deviations in their authorized Railway, and a new Line in connexion therewith; to alter the Levels of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxxiv. An Act for enabling the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company to acquire the *Hereford, Hay, and Brecon* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxxv. An Act for the better Regulation and Management of the Docks and other Works at and near to *Cardiff* of the Trustees and others claiming under the Will of the late Marquess of *Bute;* for authorizing Arrangements with Railway and other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cccxxvi. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Carnarvon and Llanberis* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cccxxvii. An Act to vest in the *Great Northern*, the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire*, and the *Midland* Railway Companies, jointly, the *Stockport and Woodley Junction*, the *Stockport, Timperley, and Altrincham Junction*, the *Cheshire Midland*, the *West Cheshire*, and the *Garston and Liverpool* Railways; and for other Purposes with respect to the said Undertakings.

cccxxviii. An Act to authorize the *Edinburgh and Glasgow* Railway Company to make a Railway from *Glasgow* to *Coatbridge*, and a Junction with the *City of Glasgow Union* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxxix. An Act for incorporating a Company for making a Railway, to be called "*The Furness and Lancaster and Carlisle Union* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

cccxxx. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *Leeds, Bradford, and Halifax Junction* Railway Company with the *Great Northern* Railway Company.

cccxxxi. An Act for the Amalgamation of the *West Yorkshire* Railway Company with the *Great Northern* Railway Company.

cccxxxii. An Act for conferring Powers on the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company for the Construction of Branch Railways and Works and the Acquisition of Lands; and for other Purposes.

cccxxxiii. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *London and North-western* Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies in *England;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxxiv. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *London and North-western* Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies in *Wales;* and for other Purposes.

cccxxxv. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *Midland* Railway Company for the Construction of Works, and otherwise in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cccxxxvi. An Act to repeal the Act relating to the *Moses Gate and Ringley* Branch Turnpike Roads, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof; and to authorize new Works; and for other Purposes.

cccxxxvii. An Act to authorize the Widening and Extension of the *Nantlle* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cccxxxviii. An Act for making a Railway from *Christian Malford* in the County of *Wilts* to *Beachingstoke* in the same County.

cccxxxix. An Act to authorize the *North Staffordshire* Railway Company to construct certain Railways forming a Loop Line of Railway in the *Staffordshire Potteries;* and for other Purposes.

cccxl. An Act for authorizing the *Peterborough, Wisbeach, and Sutton* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Crowland;* and for other Purposes.

cccxli. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways in the County of *Salop*, to be called "*The Shrewsbury and Potteries Junction* Railway;" and for other Purposes."

cccxlii. An Act for authorizing the *Sirhowy* Railway Company to construct a Railway in substitution for the authorized Extension of their Railway to the *Merthyr, Tredegar, and Abergavenny* Railway, and to deviate their authorized Railway in the Parish of *Bedwellty*, and to use Parts of the *Merthyr, Tredegar, and Abergavenny* Railway; and for confirming the Mode in which certain Roads have been crossed or diverted by the Company; and for suspending the Operation of certain Provisions of "The *Sirhowy* Railway Act, 1860," as to Passenger Trains to be run upon the Railways of the Company and the *Monmouthshire* Railway ; and for other Purposes.

cccxliii. An Act for authorizing "The *South-eastern* Railway Company" to make new Lines of Railway by way of Extensions of their Railway at *Greenwich*, *Woolwich*, and *Cranbrook* respectively ; to acquire additional Lands ; to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

cccxliv. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in *Essex*, to be called "The *South Essex* Railway."

cccxlv. An Act to authorize the *Strathspey* Railway Company to extend their Railway ; and for other Purposes.

cccxlvi. An Act to authorize the *Ryde* Pier Company to construct certain Tramways at *Ryde* in the *Isle of Wight ;* and for other Purposes.

cccxlvii. An Act to authorize the *London, Chatham and Dover* Railway Company to make a short connecting Railway at *Beckenham*, and to abandon certain authorized Lines ; to make Provisions as to the working of their Traffic and that of the *South-eastern* Railway Company ; to confer further Powers with reference to the *Kent Coast* Railway, and Exemptions from Dues and Privileges at *Broadstairs, Ramsgate*, and *Margate ;* and for other Purposes.

cccxlviii. An Act for authorizing the Construction of Railways from *Bury St. Edmunds* in the County of *Suffolk* to *Thetford* in the County of *Norfolk;* and for other Purposes.

cccxlix. An Act to authorize the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company to extend their Railway to the *Mumbles*.

cccl. An Act for making a Railway from *Navan* in the County of *Meath* to *Kingscourt* in the County of *Cavan*.

cccli. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways from *Waterford* to *Dungarvan* in the County of *Waterford*, and from *Lismore* in the County of *Waterford* to *Fermoy* in the County of *Cork ;* and for other Purposes.

ccclii. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Carmarthenshire* Railway Company ; and for other Purposes.

cccliii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Great Southern and Western* Railway at *Thurles* to *Clonmel*.

cccliv. An Act to enable the *Chichester and Midhurst* Railway Company to extend their Railway to the *London and South-western* Railway near *Haslemere;* and for other Purposes.

ccclv. An Act for making and maintaining "The *Bedford and Northampton* Railway ;" and for other Purposes.

ccclvi. An Act for making an Extension of the *Blane Valley* Railway in the County of *Stirling*, and a Diversion of Part of the said Railway ; and for other Purposes.

ccclvii. An Act for the Extension of the *Drayton Junction* Railway to *Bettisfield ;* and for other Purposes.

ccclviii. An Act for making a Railway from *Girvan* in the County of *Ayr* to *East Challoch* in the County of *Wigtown ;* and for other Purposes.

ccclix. An Act for enabling the *Midland* Railway Company to construct Railways from *Mansfield* to *Southwell*, and from *Mansfield* to *Worksop*, with a Branch to *Staveley*, and other Branches ; and for other Purposes.

ccclx. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in the County of *Monmouth*, to be called the "*Newport and Usk* Railway ;" and for other Purposes .

ccclxi. An Act to enable the *Northampton and Banbury Junction* Railway Company to make a Branch at *Blisworth ;* to raise additional Capital ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxii. An Act to enable the *Northampton and Banbury Junction* Railway Company to extend their Railway to *Chipping Norton* and *Blockley;* and for other Purposes.

ccclxiii. An Act to enable the *North-eastern* Railway Company to construct Branch Railways in the North Riding of *Yorkshire*, and abandon Portions of Railway ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxiv. An Act for making Railways from the *Newport, Abergavenny*, and *Hereford* Line of the *Great Western* Railway Company at *Pontypool* to *Caerleon*, and to the *Great Western* Railway at or near *Newport ;* and for other Purposes.

ccclxv. An Act for authorizing the Company of Proprietors of the *Regent's* Canal to improve their *Limehouse* Basin, and make a new Entrance thereto from the River *Thames*, and a Wharf on the *Thames*, and other Works, at *Limehouse ;* for regulating their Capital, and authorizing them to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxvi. An Act for making Railways in *Gloucestershire* to connect certain Railways on the East with Railways on the West of the River *Severn;* and for other Purposes.

ccclxvii. An Act for incorporating a Company for making a Railway, to be called "The *South Wales and Great Western Direct* Railway ;" and for other Purposes.

ccclxviii. An Act for the Amalgamation of the Undertakings of the *West Hartlepool* Harbour and Railway Company and the *Cleveland* Railway Company with that of the *North-eastern* Railway Company ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxix. An Act to incorporate a Company for making the *Limerick and North Kerry Junction* Railway ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxx. An Act for authorizing the *Bodmin and Wadebridge* Railway Company to improve the Line of their Railway, and to abandon Portions thereof, and to raise further Monies ; and for authorizing Arrangements between them and other Railway Companies ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxi. An Act to enable the *Mid-Wales* Railway Company to make Extensions to the Westward, and to abandon the Formation of the *Llangurig* Branch authorized to be made by "The *Mid-Wales* Railway (*Llangurig* Branch, &c.) Act, 1863 ;" and for other Purposes.

ccclxxii. An Act for authorizing the *West London* Docks and Warehouses Company to extend their Limits of Deviation ; to divert or stop up Roads ; to alter and vary their Rates and Duties and Rates of Interest ; to change their Name ; to raise further Monies ; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxiii. An Act for making a Railway from the *Cornwall* Railway near *Saltash* to the *Tamar Kit Hill and Callington* Railway at *Callington* in the County of *Cornwall*.

ccclxxiv. An Act for authorizing the *Launceston*, *Bodmin, and Wadebridge Junction* Railway Company to make an Extension Railway from the *Bodmin and Wadebridge Junction* Railway at *Ruthern Bridge* to the *Cornwall* Railway at *Truro,* and to raise further Monies; and for changing the name of the Company; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxv. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from the *North Kent* Railway to the *Medway,* and of a Pier in that River; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxvi. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway in the County of *Glamorgan,* to be called "The *Afon Valley* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

ccclxxvii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Dock and other Works at or near *Newport* on the Western side of the River *Usk,* to be called "The *Alexandra* Dock," and of Railways to connect the same with neighbouring Railways; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxviii. An Act for authorizing the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company to make a Railway to *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

ccclxxix. An Act for making certain Railways from the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway to the *East Grinstead, Groombridge, and Tunbridge Wells* Railway, and to the *Brighton, Uckfield, and Tunbridge Wells* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxx. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Railway from the *South Wales* Railway to *Fishguard Bay,* and of a Harbour there; and for other Purposes.

ccclxxxi. An Act to extend the Time limited for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works by the Acts relating to the *Waterford and Passage* Railway Company.

ccclxxxii. An Act to authorize the Construction of Railways in and near *Dublin,* to be called "The *Dublin Metropolitan Junction* Railways."

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act to enlarge and amend the Powers and Provisions relating to the Management and Improvement of the Property subject to the Trusts of the Will of the Most Noble *Francis* late Duke of *Bridgewater*.
2. An Act for modifying the Trusts of the Settled Estates of the Right Honourable *George James* Earl of *Winchilsea and Nottingham*, declared by his Marriage Settlement, and to take effect during his Lifetime, and of which the Short Title is "Earl of *Winchilsea's* Estate Act, 1865."
3. An Act for the better carrying into effect of "Baroness *Windsor's* Estate Act, 1857."
4. An Act for amending, extending, and enlarging the Powers and modifying certain Conditions as to Residence contained in the Will and Codicils of the Right Honourable *John* Lord *Rolle* deceased.
5. An Act for confirming an Agreement between the Right Honourable *Charles Morgan Robinson* Lord *Tredegar* and Promoters of the *Alexandra* Dock Company for the Conveyance to the Company of Lands forming Part of his Settled Estates, and the making by Trustees of the Settlement of the Estates out of Trust Monies subject to the Settlement of a Contribution towards the Capital of the Company; and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "Lord *Tredegar's* Estate Act, 1865."
6. An Act for confirming Sales of Parts of an Estate called *Garthmeilio*, belonging to *John Wynne* Esquire, who has been found a Lunatic by Inquisition, and for authorizing the Sale of further Parts of the same Estate for the Purpose of paying Costs incurred in the Matter of his Lunacy, and certain of his private Debts.
7. An Act for enabling the Testamentary Trustees of Sir *William Francis Eliott* of *Stobs* and *Wells*, Baronet, deceased, to sell the Trust Estates or Parts thereof for the Purpose of paying off or providing for the Payment of the Debts which affect or which may be made to affect the same, and for other Purposes in relation thereto.
8. An Act to authorize the borrowing of Money on the Security of the Entailed Estate of *Downie Park* in the County of *Forfar*, or the Sale of a Portion of the Estate, for the Purpose of paying the Debts and Legacies affecting the same.
9. An Act for authorizing Sales of Fisheries and Rights of Fishing and other Hereditaments by the Provost of the College of the *Holy and Undivided Trinity* of Queen *Elizabeth* near *Dublin* in his Corporate Capacity; and for other Purposes.

PRIVATE ACT,

NOT PRINTED.

10. An Act to enable *Abraham Edwards*, Clerk, to exercise his Office of a Priest, and to hold any Benefice or Preferment in the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*.

[INDEX.

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1865.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª;" Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*The Ballot,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply" indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE SEVENTH SESSION OF

THE EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

28° & 29° VICTORIA.

1865.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

☞ When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

ABINGDON GAOL
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [177] 116

Abolition of Arrest upon Final Process Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Mar* 9, [177] 1365 (No. 26)
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 13

Abolition of Arrest on Final Process (No. 2) Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 13 (No. 33)

Abyssinia, Imprisonment of British Subjects in
Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 24, [178] 957; Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 27, 1075

Abyssinia, Imprisonment of British Subjects in—cont.
Address for Copies of Letters and Papers, (*Lord Chelmsford*) *May* 23, [179] 726; after long debate, Cont. 43, Not-Cont. 42; M. 1; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 739; Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, Earl Russell *May* 30, 1043; Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, Earl Russell *June* 13, [180] 109; Observations, Sir Hugh Cairns; Reply, Mr. Layard; long debate thereon *June* 30, 992; Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, Earl Russell *July* 4, 1145 — *Parl. P.* [1951]

Acts of Parliament, Obsolete
Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 25, [178] 1002

ADAIR, Mr. H. E., *Ipswich*
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1195

ADDERLEY, Right Hon. C. B., *Staffordshire, N.*
Africa—Western Coast of, Comm. moved for, [177] 535
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 119
British Kaffraria, Comm. [177] 1097; *cl.* 2, 1098
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 814
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1025; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [180] 513; 3R. 842
Colonial Naval Defence, Comm. [177] 1823
Companies Workmens' Education, 2R. [180] 446
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 884; Minute of Council, [178] 1317, 1318
Mayne, Sir R., and the Barnet Magistrates, [178] 719
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1497
Prisons, Leave, [177] 220; Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1332
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1341
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 333; Comm. [179] 124, 127

Admiralty, &c., Acts Repeal Bill
(*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Read 1ª* *June* 16 (No. 165)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee*; Report *June* 22
Read 3ª* *June* 23
c. Read 1º* *June* 23 [Bill 242]
Read 2º* *June* 26
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3º* *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 112]

Admiralty Powers, &c., Bill
(*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Read 1ª* *June* 16 (No. 166)
Read 2ª* *June* 20
Committee*; Report *June* 22
Read 3ª* *June* 23 (No. 245)
c. Read 1º* *June* 23 [Bill 243]
Read 2º* *June* 26
Committee* (*on re-comm*); Report *June* 29
Read 3º* *June* 30 [Bill 245]
Royal Assent *July* 6 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 112]

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. J. Moncreiff), *Edinburgh*
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 779
Judicial Statistics, Scotch, [177] 958
Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 196
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 902; Res. Amendt. 1072
Medical Practitioners, Scotch, [177] 600
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 183, 538
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), [177] 1042
Supply—Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [179] 601;—Fishery Board (Scotland), 1306
Writs Registration (Scotland), Leave, [177] 633; 2R. [178] 1156, 1168, 1571; Comm. [179] 1203, 1337
Writs Registration, &c. (Scotland), Leave, [177] 952

Affirmations (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Edward Craufurd, Mr. Dunlop*)
c. Ordered* *Feb* 22
Read 1º* *Feb* 24 [Bill 40]
Read 2º* *Mar* 8
Committee*; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3º* *Mar* 13
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Chelmsford*) *Mar* 14 (No. 37)
Read 2ª after short debate *Mar* 21, [178] 1
Committee* *Mar* 23; Report* *Mar* 24 (No. 42)
Read 3ª* *Mar* 27
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 9]

Africa—(Western Coast)
Select Committee appointed "to consider the state of the British Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa" (*Mr. Adderley*) *Feb* 21, [177] 535
And, on March 3, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Adderley (Chairman), Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Sir Francis Baring, Lord Stanley, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Sir John Hay, Mr. Buxton, Lord Alfred Churchill, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Baxter, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Cheetham, and Mr. Cave; March 6, The Marquess of Hartington and Mr. H. Seymour added
Report *June* 26—(*Parl. P.* No. 412)
Cape Colony—The Kaffirs, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 29, [179] 976
(See *Ashantee*)

African Merchants' Company, Subsidy to
Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 27, [177] 747

AGAR-ELLIS, Hon. L. G. F., *Kilkenny Co.*
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 265

Agricultural Gangs
Motion for an Address, "That the Commission appointed to inquire into the Employment of Children and young Persons in trades and Manufactures not already regulated by Law, do include within its Inquiries Children and young Persons employed in some Parts of the Country under an organized System known as that of Agricultural Gangs" (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *May* 12, [179] 174; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Agricultural Parishes
On Motion of *Mr. Knight,* Return ordered *Feb* 27, [177] 830; Motion for further Returns (*Mr. Knight*); Debate adjourned; Debate resumed *Mar* 6; Returns ordered, 1201—(*Parl. P.* No. 151)

Agricultural Statistics
Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 31, [178] 560

AIRLIE, Earl of
Canada—Defences of, [178] 1526
North West Territory—British North America, [177] 588

Albemarle, Earl of
Singapore and the Straits Settlements, [180] 437

Alderney, Breakwater at
Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 19, [179] 560

Alkali Act—Inspector's Report—Parl. P. [1935]
Observations, The Earl of Derby *May* 22, [179] 631

Angerstein, Mr. W., *Greenwich*
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [178] 992
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1010
Navy Estimates—Wages to Artificers at Home, [178] 946
New Cross Roads, 2R. Amendt. [177] 496, 497

Anglo-Austrian Commercial Treaty
Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 15, [180] 264

Anson, Hon. Major A. H. A., *Lichfield*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 116
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 832

Anstruther, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Scotland—Postal System of Fife, [178] 370

Anti-Slavery Society
Petition presented by Lord Brougham *June* 13, [180] 122

Appeal Committee
l. Appointed *Feb* 7

Archdall, Captain M. E., *Fermanagh Co.*
Game Licences (Ireland), Leave, [177] 224

Argentine Republic, The—Treatment of a British Officer
Question, Admiral Walcott; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 20, [180] 540

Argyll, Duke of (Lord Privy Seal)
British Kaffraria, 2R. [177] 1531, 1532
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [178] 1188; Comm. *cl.* 16, 1314
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *add. cl.* [178] 1588
Edmunds, Leonard—Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1221
India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 282

Army
Army and Navy Expenditure, considered in Committee *June* 15, [180] 331; Resolutions, Lord Clarence Paget and The Marquess of Hartington, agreed to

[*cont,*

Army—*cont.*
Artillery
Armstrong and Whitworth Guns, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 17, [177] 320; Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 16, 1739; Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 9, [179] 48; Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 16, [180] 366
Armstrong Gun Commission, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 16, [180] 368
Armstrong Guns for Foreign Governments, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 2, [177] 960
Armstrong 12-pounder Guns, Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 20, [177] 449
Enfield Rifles, Conversion of, Question, Mr. H. H. Vivian; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 16, [179] 388
Guns for Coast Defences, Observations, Mr. Henry Berkeley; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington; debate thereon *Mar* 20, [177] 1924
Mackay's Gun, Question, Mr. J. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 30, [180] 983
Rifle Brigade and Whitworth Rifles, Question, Sir Frederick Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 20, [177] 1920

Chaplains, Dress of, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 23, [180] 731
Chaplains in New Zealand, Question, Colonel Herbert; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington; Debate thereon *June* 2, [179] 1224
Commissions, Issue of, Question, The Earl of Longford; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *June* 30, [180] 971
Contagious Diseases Prevention Act, Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 19, [179] 562
Dawkins, Lieutenant Colonel, Case of, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 22, [179] 641; after long debate, Question, "That this House do now adjourn;" A. 112, N. 172; M. 60; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 23, 744
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 26, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of all Correspondence relating to the first Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Colonel Dawkins in or about July 1864, &c." (*Mr. Darby Griffith*), [179] 879; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to; Explanation, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 29, 1041; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 9, [179] 1336
Depôt Battalions, Explanation, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 24, [178] 241
Field Allowance to Officers at Aldershot, Question, Major Knox; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 30, [180] 984
Foot Guards, The, Questions, Sir John Trelawny; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 89

[*cont,*

Army—*cont.*

Gardens, Cultivation of, by Soldiers, Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 3, [178] 670

Gunpowder

Accidents by, Question, Mr. A. F. Egerton; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 26, [179] 877

Government Powder Magazines, Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 10, [177] 135

Storage of, Question, Mr. Serjeant Kinglake; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 6, [177] 1116

Hymn Book for the Army and Navy, Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *June* 27, [180] 859

Libraries, &c., Address for Copy of Catalogue of Books, &c. (*Mr. Whalley*) *Mar* 21, [178] 47; after debate, Question put, and negatived

Military Commissioners to the United States, Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 83

Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, Observations, The Earl of Dalhousie; Reply, Earl De Grey and Ripon; long debate thereon *Mar* 6, [177] 1099

Military Reserve Fund, Question, Lord Hotham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 3, [177] 1043; Question, Lord Hotham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 22, [179] 639

Military Store Department, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 6, [177] 1123

Military Telegraphs, Question, Captain Jervis; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 18, [179] 491

Military Train, Question, Mr. Rogers; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 22, [179] 641

Militia Travelling Allowances, Question, Sir Henry Stracey; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 28, [177] 846

Number of the Army, Question, Colonel Gilpin; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 27, [177] 746

Ordnance Experiments, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 3, [178] 672

Ordnance Select Committee, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 28, [178] 371; Observations, Mr. H. Baillie; Debate thereon *June* 2, [179] 1216

Ordnance Survey, Question, Sir William Jolliffe; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 3, [177] 1091; Observations, Mr. Digby Seymour; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 12, [179] 211

Promotion in Rifle Corps, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 9, [179] 47

Rating of Houses of Officers, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 19, [179] 587

Recruiting, Address for a Royal Commission (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *Feb* 21, [177] 515; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 28, [178] 372; Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 20, [180] 539

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Regimental Paymasters, Question, Mr. H. E. Surtees; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 16, [180] 366

Regimental Quartermasters, Question, Sir Frederick Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Feb* 9, [177] 115

Roman Catholic or Irish Recruits, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 16, [177] 1739; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 22, [179] 639

Sentences of Courts Martial, Question, Mr. Morritt; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Mar* 3, [177] 1042

Sutherland, Dr., Employment of, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 19, [180] 441; Question, Colonel Herbert; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 30, 989

Tower, Deputy Lieutenancy of the, Question, Sir John Trelawny; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 3, [177] 1044

Volunteer Officers, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 14, [177] 1662 — *Service on Juries*, Question, Mr. Algernon Egerton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 3, [178] 671

Volunteer Sergeant Instructors, Allowances to, Question, Sir Graham Montgomery; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 86

Volunteers, Drill Instructors of, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 3, [178] 671

War Office, The, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 17, [177] 1830; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 24, [178] 202

Arrests for Debt Abolition (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Hennessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 126]
Read 2° * *June* 14
Bill withdrawn * *June* 16

Ashantee, Rumoured Expedition against
Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 17, [177] 323

Ashworth, Case of Mr. Charles
Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 9, [177] 118

Atkinson, Matthew, Execution at Durham of
Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 21, [178] 7

Attorney General, The (Sir Roundell Palmer), *Richmond*

Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, Res. [178] 1611; Comm. [179] 51, 54; Report, 1233, 1234, 1245

Bankruptcy Act, Select Committee moved for, [177] 123; [178] 958; Res. 1113

[*cont.*

ATTORNEY GENERAL—*cont.*
  Bankruptcy Laws, [179] 49
  China—British Subjects in, [177] 1949; [178] 782
  Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 656; Comm. *cl.* 2, 840
  County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 858; Comm. [180] 680; *cl.* 1, 681; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 682; *cl.* 14, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 683, 684; Consid. *cl.* 20, 847
  Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 500, 512, 532, 894
  Court of Chancery (Ireland) (No. 2), Leave, [177] 311; 2R. 1027
  Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 157, 193, 197; 2R. 294, 299; Comm. 604, 605; *add. cl.* 606, 607; Lords Amendts. Amendt. [179] 1183
  Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 934, 938; Comm. [178] 178, 179, 589; Lords Amendt. [179] 1184
  Criminal Cases (Evidence), 2R. deferred, [177] 945
  Crown Suits, &c. [179] 490
  Dyce Sombre Case, The, [180] 1019, 1022
  Episcopal Church in the Colonies, [178] 276, 277
  Forfeitures on Conviction of Felony, [177] 205; [180] 445
  Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 1320, 1321; Consid. *cl.* 13, [180] 503
  Inland Revenue, Comm. Preamble, [180] 308
  Inns of Court, 2R. [178] 1049
  Ireland—Circulation of Lottery Tickets, [179] 1121
  Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. [178] 750; *cl.* 7, 751; Amendt. 752; *cl.* 11, 753; Amendt. 754, 757
  Law of Evidence, 2.R [177] 941; Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 314; *cl.* 2, 316
  Mortgage Debentures, Comm. [178] 455
  Obsolete Acts of Parliament, [178] 1002
  Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1290; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 529, 531; *add. cl.* 536, 539
  Patent Laws, [177] 1475;—Hon. R. Bethell, [179] 392
  Patent Office — Alleged Irregularities in the, [177] 1120, 1122
  Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 841; Comm. 1182; *cl.* 6, [180] 87; *cl.* 29, 88; *add. cl.* 331
  Registrarship of the Court of Bankruptcy, Leeds, [179] 293, 489; Comm. moved for, 776; [180] 893, 895, 907, 908, 1120
  Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 618, 619
  Rupert's Land, [178] 1601
  Simony, Law of, [180] 982
  Stonor, Mr., Appointment of, [178] 563, 567
  United States—The Reciprocity Treaty, Papers moved for, [177] 414;—Extradition Treaty with, 1537
  Winslow, Mr., Pension to, [180] 1041

Attorneys and Solicitors' Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 24, [177] 634 (No. 15)
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 10, 1463; after debate, Cont. 21, Not-Cont. 23; M. 2; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1474

Attorneys', &c., Certificate Duty
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 19, To leave out from "That the" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is just and expedient that the annual Duty payable upon Certificates taken out by Attorneys, Solicitors, and Proctors in England and Ireland, and by Writers to the Signet, Solicitors, Agents, Attorneys, and Procurators in Scotland, should be abolished" (*Mr. Denman*), [179] 564; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, A. 143, N. 146; M. 3; Words added; Main Question, as amended, agreed to

Augmentation Act
  Returns presented (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Feb* 14, [177] 225—(*Parl. P.* No. 7)

Australia, Transportation to
  Question, Mr. Moor; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 10, [177] 137; Petitions (*Lord Taunton*) *Feb* 27, 737

Ayr Burghs Election Bill
(*Mr. Edward Craufurd, Viscount Bury*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *May* 25 [Bill 166]
  Read 2º* *June* 1
  Committee*; Report *June* 8
  Considered as amended* *June* 19
  Read 3º* *June* 20
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 20
  Read 2ª* *June* 27 (No. 186)
  Committee*; Report *June* 29
  Read 3ª* *June* 30
  Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 92]

AYRTON, Mr. A. S., *Tower Hamlets*
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1788, 1999;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 249;—Military Education, 256;—Miscellaneous Services, 262, 263
  Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, [179] 1246
  Bank Notes Issue, Comm. Amendt. [178] 1252, 1264; *cl.* 8, 1267; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 812
  Bankruptcy Act (1861), Res. 426, [179] 1111
  Borough Franchise Extension, Leave, [177] 560; 2R. [178] 1445
  Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1606
  Civil Service Estimates, Adj. moved, [178] 741, 742
  Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1517; Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 670
  County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 858; Comm. Amendt. [180] 679, 681; *add. cl.* Amendt. 684
  County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges Salaries), Res. [180] 528
  County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 12, [179] 101
  Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 868
  Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 186
  Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Lords Amendts. [179] 1185
  Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 482, 483
  Dyce Sombre Case, The, [180] 1022

[*cont.*

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
East India (Revenue Accounts), Report, [180] 1024
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 910
Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment, Comm. [177] 632
Exeter, Diocese of, [178] 933
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 834; Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [180] 530; *cl.* 11, 531; Amendt. 532; *cl.* 17, 533; *add. cl.* 534
Government Annuities, [177] 957
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1001; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1315; *cl.* 10, 1320; *cl.* 20, Amendt. [180] 124, 126
India—The Budget, [180] 260
Inland Revenue, Comm. Preamble, [180] 307
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1659
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 317
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 784; [180] 910
Libel, 2R. [179] 787
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 652
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 1060, 1070; *cl.* 4, 1067, 1068
Mayne, Sir R., and the Barnet Magistrates, [178] 721
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 843; Consid. Amendt. [178] 881; *add. cl.* 1000
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [178] 538; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 765
Metropolitan Police Rate, [177] 1901
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1057
Mines, Comm. moved for, [179] 72, 73
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [177] 275
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 399
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [178] 728;—Scientific Departments, 731;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 947
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 198
Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment, Leave, [177] 256; 2R. [178] 868; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [179] 542, 546; *add. cl.* 553, 554
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 624
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1354
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 620
Saturday Half-holiday and the Civil Service, [180] 45
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1560
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [179] 604;—Woods, Forests, &c. 709, 711; [180] 481;—British Museum, [179] 1351;—Post Office Packet Service, 1361;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 496
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 232
Transport Service between England and India, [180] 1022
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 496, 516
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1460; [178] 1021
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, [178] 1509

AYTOUN, Mr. R. S., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Canadian Railways, [178] 234
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1206

Azeem Jah
COMMONS—
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the claim of His Highness Prince Azeem Jah to the title and dignity of Nawab of the Carnatic, and the claims of His Highness under a Treaty entered into in 1801 between the Honourable the East India Company and his Highness Prince Azeem-ul-Dowlah" (*Sir FitzRoy Kelly*) *Mar* 14, [177] 1663; after long debate, A. 38, N. 53; M. 15
Forged Signatures to Petitions, Special Report of the Public Petitions Committee (*Mr. Charles Forster*); short debate thereon *Mar* 16, [177] 1735; Select Committee appointed *Mar* 23
And, on March 24, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Charles Forster (Chairman), Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir James Fergusson, Major Gavin, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Taverner John Miller, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Owen Stanley, Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Mr. Hennessy, and Mr. Cox
Report of Select Committee *April* 28—(*Parl. P.* No. 231)
Report considered *May* 8, [178] 1604
Motion, "That George Morris Mitchell, having fabricated signatures to several Petitions presented to this House, and having knowingly procured other fabricated signatures to such Petitions, has been guilty of a Breach of the Privileges of this House" (*Mr. C. Forster*)
After debate, Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "the Report of the Committee be re-committed to the said Committee" (*Lord R. Cecil*); Question, "That the words &c.;" after further debate, Debate adjourned—(*Parl. P.* No. 317)
Adjourned debate [8th May] resumed; after further debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn *May* 9, [179] 51
Ordered, That the Report of the Committee be re-committed to the said Committee (*Mr. Attorney General*)
Petition of George Morris Mitchell referred to Committee
Report of Select Committee *May* 26—(*Parl. P.* No. 317)
Report of Select Committee considered *June* 2
After long debate resolved, "That George Morris Mitchell, having fabricated signatures to several Petitions presented to this House, and having knowingly procured other fabricated signatures to such Petitions, has been guilty of Contempt and a Breach of the Privileges of this House" *June* 2, [179] 1230; Motion agreed to
Motion, "That George Morris Mitchell be, for his said offence, committed to Her Majesty's Gaol of Newgate; and that Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrants accordingly;" after long debate, A. 41, N. 7; M. 34
Motion, "That Powell Marshall and Henry Whitehead having, in consort with George Morris Mitchell, fabricated signatures to several Petitions presented to this House, have been guilty of Contempt and a Breach of the Privileges of this House" (*Mr. Charles Forster*) 1246; after long debate, A. 39, N. 5; M. 34

[*cont.*

Azeem Jah—cont.
  The Serjeant at Arms reported he had on Friday last taken into his custody Powell Marshall and Henry Whitehead, but that he had not yet succeeded in apprehending George Morris Mitchell *June* 8, [179] 1266
  Petitions from the said Powell Marshall and Henry Whitehead, brought up, and read
  After debate, ordered, that the said Powell Marshall and Henry Whitehead, having expressed their regret and contrition for their offence, be discharged out of the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, without payment of their fees
  The Sergeant at Arms informed the House, that George Morris Mitchell had been this day apprehended, and was now in Newgate *June* 19, [180] 514
  Petition of George Morris Mitchell, a State Prisoner in Her Majesty's Gaol of Newgate, expressing his deep contrition and regret if he has offended against the dignity of the House, and praying for his release from custody, brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [App. 2.]

BAGWELL, Mr. J., *Clonmel*
  Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 786
  Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 1512, 1514; Comm. Preamble, [179] 986; *cl.* 8, 992; *add. cl.* 995
  County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [178] 266
  Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 684
  Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 508
  Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 461, 464
  Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 502
  Union Medical Officers (Ireland), [177] 319
  Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1907
  University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 547

BAILLIE, Mr. H. J., *Invernesshire*
  Army—Armstrong 12-pounder Guns, [177] 449, 450;—Armstrong and Whitworth Guns, 1739; [179] 48; [180] 366;—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 662;—Ordnance Select Committee, 1216
  Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 293
  Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1932
  Herring Fishery (Scotland), [177] 846
  Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 962, 984, 992
  Navy—The "Achilles," [178] 1081
  South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 362

BAINES, Mr. E., *Leeds*
  Anglo-Austrian Commercial Treaty, [180] 264
  Borough Franchise Extension, Leave, [177] 559, 561, 957; 2R. [178] 1372, 1394, 1396, 1448, 1450, 1470, 1675, 1676
  Consular Reports, [178] 8
  Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1209
  Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1890

Ballot, The
  Question, Mr. H. Berkeley; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 24, [177] 660
    Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 16, To add after the word "That" in the original Question, the words "as a General Election is impending, and as we have no Law which can put down the intimidation of Voters nor prevent Bribery, it is therefore expedient that a trial should be given to the Vote by Ballot" (*Mr. Henry Berkeley*), [180] 416; Question, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, A. 74, N. 118; M. 44
    Another Amendt. To add after the word "That," in the original Question, the words "this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee of Supply" (*Viscount Palmerston*), 427; Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to; Words added; original Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

BANDON, Earl
  Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 970
  Ireland—Case of Catherine Gaughan, [179] 1186

Bank Notes (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Colonel French*)
c. Acts read; considered in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° *May* 2, [178] 1371
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 21, [180] 604
  After short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn [Bill 124]

Bank Notes Issue Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
177] *Banks of Issue*, considered in Committee; Resolutions (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 10, 150
  Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 12]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 23, 608
. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient to inquire into the working and effects of the Acts 7 & 8 *Vict.* c 32, and 8 & 9 *Vict.* c. 38, regulating Banks of Issue in the United Kingdom, and that, in the meantime, the second reading of the Bill before the House be postponed" (*Mr. Buchanan*), 608; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question agreed to; Read 2°
. Committee; Report *Mar* 17, 1909 [Bill 75]
178] Order for Committee on re-comm. read
  Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 1, 1247
  Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee; after long debate, reported
  Considered * *May* 5 [Bill 123]
[*cont.*

Bank Notes Issue Bill—cont.
Order for third reading read and discharged *May* 25
179] After long debate, Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of Clause 8 and the Preamble" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 800
Amendt. to leave out "in respect of Clause 8 and the Preamble" (*Mr. Hadfield*); Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee and reported; as amended, considered
Order for third reading discharged; Bill withdrawn *June* 1, 1123

Bank Notes Issue (Scotland)
(*Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Stirling*)
c. Considered in Committee*; Ordered *June* 20
Read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 232]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 28

Bank of Ireland (Consolidated Fund) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Ordered *Feb* 10
Read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 14]
Read 2° after debate *Feb* 20, [177] 452
Committee*; Report *Feb* 23
Read 3°* *Feb* 27
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 2
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *April* 4
Read 3ª* *April* 6 (No. 19)
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 16]

Bankruptcy Act, 1861
After debate, Select Committee appointed and nominated "to inquire into the working of the New Bankruptcy Act, and to report thereon" (*Mr. Moffatt*) *Feb* 9, [177] 120
Committee:—Mr. Moffatt (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Murray, Mr. Malins, Mr. Weguelin, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. Crum-Ewing, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Vance, Mr. Cave, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Taverner John Miller, and Mr. Ayrton; Feb 24, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson disch. and Mr. Dunlop added
Report of Select Committee *Mar* 21—(*Parl. P.* No. 144)
Question, Mr. Murray; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 24, [178] 958
Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Report of the Select Committee on the Bankruptcy Act of 1861 deserves the prompt and serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Moffatt*) *May* 16, [179] 420; [House counted out;] Motion again proposed *May* 30, 1109; after debate, Motion agreed to
Court of, Observations, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 9, [177] 93
Laws, Question, Mr. Paull; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 9, [179] 49

Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Read 1°* *Feb* 21 [Bill 34]
Read 2°* *Feb* 23
[*cont.*

Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill—cont.
Committee*; Report *Feb* 24
Read 3°* *Feb* 27 [Bill 103]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 2 (No. 20)
177] Read 2ª after short debate *Mar* 7, 1221
Referred to Select Committee, after short debate *Mar* 14, 1645
And, on March 16, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Steward, E. Belmore, V. Hutchinson, L. Boyle, L. Silchester, L. Somerhill, L. Chaworth, L. Cranworth, L. Belper, L. Chelmsford
Report of Select Committee* *Mar* 23
Committee* *Mar* 24 (Nos. 43 & 44)
178] Amendts. reported *Mar* 27, 273
An Amendt. moved (*The Earl of Longford*); Cont. 18, Not-Cont. 21; M. 3; List of Cont. and Not.-Cont., 274
Read 3ª* *Mar* 28
c. Lords Amendment considered, and one disagreed to *April* 6, 785
l. Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to Amendment considered *May* 2, 1305 (No. 66)
Moved, "Not to insist, &c." (*The Lord Steward*); after short debate, Cont. 33, Not-Cont. 43; M. 10; resolved in the negative; the rest of the Commons' Amendments agreed to; Protest against not insisting, 1308
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 21]

Bankruptcy, Leeds, Registrarship of the Court of
(See *Leeds Court of Bankruptcy*)

Baring, Rt. Hon. Sir F. T., *Portsmouth*
Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. [180] 296

Baring, Mr. H. B., *Marlborough*
British Passports to Rome, [177] 450

Baring, Mr. T., *Huntingdon*
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 631
National Gallery—Mr. Frith's "Derby Day," [178] 1238
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1294; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 527; *add. cl.* 534

Baring, Mr. T. G. (Under Secretary for the Home Department), *Penryn & Falmouth*
Cattle, Diseases in, [177] 1117
County Voters Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 103
Devizes Turnpike Trust, [179] 562
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 828; Comm. *cl.* 6, [180] 530; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 532; *cl.* 17, 533; *add. cl.* 534; Consid. *cl.* 18, 718
Fires in London, [178] 7
Gunpowder, Accidents from, [179] 877
Inclosure, 2R. [178] 540
India—Claims of the Satpoora and Goa Frontier Field Forces, [180] 950
Local Government Supplemental, Comm. [178] 1034, 1035
Middlesex Industrial Schools, Report, [179] 976
New Cross Roads, 2R. [177] 497
[*cont.*

Baring, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
Newington Green and Hornsey Road, [178] 1239
Police—Houses of Parliament, [179] 1102;—at Public Buildings, [180] 131
Police Superannuation, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [178] 1071; *add. cl.* 1072, 1073
Registration of County Voters, [177] 1475
Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Leave, [178] 1024, 1026; Comm. *cl.* 28, [180] 364; *add. cl.* 365; Consid. *cl.* 31, Amendt. 592
Salmon Fishery Acts, [178] 889
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 256
Theatres, &c. Leave, [177] 1529
Transport Service between England and India, [180] 1023
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [180] 687; *cl.* 1, 689, 845; Schedule, 846
Turnpike Trusts, [178] 1469

Barrow, Mr. W. H., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1144
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 275, 280
Prisons, 2R. [177] 1362; Comm. *cl.* 21, [179] 1329; Schedule 1, 1333, 1335

Barttelot, Colonel W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Malt, Res. [177] 1275
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1495

Bass, Mr. M. T., *Derby*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [177] 1979
Bankruptcy Act (1861), Res. [179] 1111
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1153
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 275, 280
Railway Clauses, Comm. Amendt. [180] 616

Bateson, Sir T., *Devizes*
Ireland—County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 196, 197;—Law Adviser to the Castle, [180] 1042
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 467

Bath, Marquess of
Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 959
Edmunds, Leonard—Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1217, 1219;—Pension, Res. [179] 34, 44
Private Bill Costs, Report, *add. cl.* [178] 483
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [177] 735
Union Chargeability, Comm. [180] 351

Bath, Order of the
Amendt. on Committee of Supply, Address for Copy of Regulations *June* 16, [180] 400; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Baxter, Mr. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Alderney—Breakwater at, [179] 560
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 612
British and North American Steamship Company, [177] 1368
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1288
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [179] 302
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), [177] 1042
Slave Trade, [179] 877

Bazley, Mr. T., *Manchester*
Ashworth, Mr. C., Case of, [177] 118
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1389
Collection of Taxes, [178] 669
Colonies, Protection of the, [179] 909
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 954, 961
India—Medical Officers, [180] 924
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1900

Beach, Sir M. E. Hicks-, *Gloucestershire, E.*
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [180] 687

Beecroft, Mr. G. S., *Leeds*
Bankruptcy Act (1861), Res. [179] 1112
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 479

Belfast Commission of Inquiry
Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 9, [177] 119—*Parl. P.* [3466]

Belmore, Earl of
Irish Railways, Liabilities of Shareholders in, [177] 95
Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1597
Pheasants (Ireland), 2R. [179] 630
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1457
Small Benefices (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 626

Bentinck, Mr. G. Cavendish, *Taunton*
Cartoons at Hampton Court Palace, [179] 301
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 214
Minor Canons, &c. [180] 984
Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28; Amendt. [180] 364; Consid. *cl.* 31, Amendt. 592
Supply—Royal Parks, [179] 245, 246, 247;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 257; Report, 371;—Office of Works, &c. 944, 947;—Department of Science and Art, 1171, 1180;—National Gallery, 1259;—British Historical Portrait Gallery, 1276;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1285, 1286
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1461

Bentinck, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. Amendt. [178] 104, 175
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, [179] 1240, 1246
Bank Notes Issue, 3R. [179] 1123
Borough Franchise, 2R. [178] 1470
Ceylon—Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks, [179] 1134
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [178] 1302
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 735, 737, 738
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 508
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 293, 294
Dockyard Extensions, Comm. [179] 950, 1040
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1133
France—Commercial Treaty with, [177] 1757
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1941

Bentinck, Mr. G. W. P.—*cont.*
- Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 699
- Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1063; *cl.* 4, 1068
- Mortality among Children in Norfolk, [178] 958
- Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 994
- Navy—Board of Admiralty, [178] 685
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1434; —New Works, &c. [179] 936, 941
- Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 596
- Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 110
- Railway Accidents, [177] 116; Res. 1124, 1136
- Railways (Guards and Passengers Communication), Comm. [179] 68
- Supply, Report, Res. 9, Adj. moved, [178] 359, 360, 361, 1036;—Department of Science and Art, [179] 1169, 1170, 1180
- Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 306; Comm. Instruction, [179] 116, 117; 3R. 795
- Waysand Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1494
- Wreck Abstract, [177] 1662

Berkeley, Hon. C. P. F., *Gloucester*
- Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 5, [179] 1317
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [178] 728;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 953;——New Works, &c. [179] 932

Berkeley, Hon. F. H. F., *Bristol*
- Ballot, The, [177] 660; Res. [180] 416, 427
- Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1209
- Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1924
- Industrial Exhibitions—Protection of Inventions, [177] 320
- Theatres, &c. 2R. [180] 183

Bernard, Mr. T. T. *Aylesbury*
- Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 326

Bessborough, Earl of (Master of the Buckhounds)
- Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, Papers moved for, [179] 739

Bishops' Trust Substitution Act
- Question, Mr. Mundy; Answer, Mr. Walpole *June* 19, [180] 444

Black, Mr. A., *Edinburgh*
- Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 571
- Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1259
- Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1409
- Medical Practitioners, Scotch, [177] 599

Blackburn, Mr. P., *Stirlingshire*
- Bank Notes (Ireland), 2R. [180] 608
- Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 483
- Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 836; Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [180] 533; Consid. *cl.* 18, Amendt. 718
- Hyde Park, Gardens in, [177] 1830
- Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 196

[*cont.*

Blackburn, Mr. P.—*cont.*
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 537
- Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 413
- Supply—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, [179] 600;—Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), 601;—Works and Public Buildings, 703;—Woods, Forests, &c. 706, 707;—Office of Works, &c. 943, 945, 946;—West India Relief Commission, 1136;—Landed Estates Court, 1150, 1151;—Department of Science and Art, 1180

Blake, Mr. J. A., *Waterford City*
- Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 3, [180] 105
- Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 169
- Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 820;—Poor Fishermen, [179] 914;—The Constabulary, 1338;—District Lunatic Asylums, [180] 367
- Lunatics in Gaols, [179] 593
- Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1301; 2R. [180] 597
- Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 319; 2R. 509
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [178] 55
- Sewage of the Metropolis, [177] 1479
- Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [179] 1303;—Brehon Laws (Ireland), 1308;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1310
- Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), Comm. [178] 1523
- Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908

Bonham-Carter, Mr. J., *Winchester*
- Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic—Forged Signatures, Report, [177] 1738; Comm. [179] 58; Report, 1243
- Inclosure, 2R. [178] 541
- Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 447

Borough Franchise Extension Bill
(*Mr. Baines, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Scholefield, Mr. W. E. Forster*)

177] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Baines*), 559
Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *Feb* 21 [Bill 32]
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Baines*) *May* 3, 1372
Previous Question, "That that Question be now put" (*Lord Elcho*), 1392; after long debate, Debate adjourned
Debate further adjourned *May* 4
Debate resumed *May* 8, 1613; after long debate, Previous Question, "That that Question be now put," A. 214, N. 288; M. 74; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1705

Borough Franchise Extension Bill
- Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Baines *Mar* 2, [177] 956; Observations, Sir George Grey; Answer, Mr. Baines *May* 2, [178] 1469

Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1449
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1193
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Res. [180] 1112, 1132
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 551
St. Benet, Gracechurch Street, and Allhallows, Lombard Street, [177] 321
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 246
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1458, 1460; [178] 1013, 1017

Bovill, Mr. W., *Guildford*
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 194
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 180
Dyce Sombre Case, The, [180] 1021, 1022
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1199
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1291, 1293; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 527; *add. cl.* 537, 538, 539

Bowyer, Sir G., *Dundalk*
Army — Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 525
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 787
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 493
Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit 2R. [180] 295
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 530
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 178, 180
Game (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1528
India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 861, 863
Inns of Court, Leave, [177] 829; 2R. [178] 1040, 1048, 1053
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 309
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 509
Prisons, Leave, [177] 222
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 103
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 850
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1352
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1554
Supply—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 492, 497
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1014
University Education (Ireland), Address moved [180] 588
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 781

Brady, Mr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 58; Report, 90
Army Estimates—Military Education, [178] 261;—Miscellaneous Services, 263
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 475,
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. [179] 978; *cl.* 4, 989; *add. cl.* 994, 995
Inclosure, 2R. [178] 541
Infant Mortality at Emneth, [178] 562
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 602
[*cont.*

Brady, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 887
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 508
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 258
Theatres, &c. 2R. [180] 183
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 588

Bramston, Mr. T. W., *Essex, S.*
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [179] 1263

Brazil and Uruguay
Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 10, [177] 138; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 24, 685; Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Russell *Mar* 9, 1367; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 9, 1371

Brazil, Diplomatic Relations with
Question, Mr. White; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 9, [177] 1369

Bridges, Sir B. W., *Kent, E.*
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 720
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 612
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 604

Bright, Mr. J., *Birmingham*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 658
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 164
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1611, 1613
Cobden, Mr., The late, [178] 677
Indemnity, 2R. [180] 686
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1657
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 385, 387, 391
Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 442
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 183
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1336
Saffron Hill Murder, [177] 209
United States—Claims for compensation, [177] 1372

Briscoe, Mr. J. I., *Surrey, W.*
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [178] 1266
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 649
Inclosure, Comm. [178] 628
Prisons, Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1332
Supply — New Houses of Parliament, [179] 250;—Printing and Stationery, 1142
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 516
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1484

Bristol and North Somerset Railway (Southern Extension) Bill
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gore Langton*) *April* 7, [178] 887
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Greaves*); Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and negatived; Main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Bristol, Episcopal Residence at
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 22, [180] 632

British Guiana—Coolies
Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [179] 1103

British India and Colonial Trust and Agency Corporation (Limited)
Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 29, [180] 925

British Kaffraria
Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 14, [177] 237

British Kaffraria Annexation Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Mr. C. Fortescue*)
177] c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 16, 312 [Bill 27]
Read 2°* *Feb* 23
Committee*; Report *Mar* 1 [Bill 45]
Considered* *Mar* 6
. Considered in Committee; after debate, reported *Mar* 3, 1093
Read 3°* *Mar* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 9
. Read 2ª after debate *Mar* 13, 1531 (No. 27)
Committee*; Report *Mar* 14
Read 3ª* *Mar* 16 (No. 34)
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [28 *Vict.* c. 5]

British Museum
Petition of Trustees of the British Museum (*Earl Stanhope*) *Mar* 22, [177] 956; withdrawal of Notice of Motion (*Earl Stanhope*) *Mar* 13, 1530; Observations, Mr. Walpole; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, 1534; Question, Mr. Augustus Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18, [179] 488
Enlargement of the, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 16, [179] 390

British North America
Canada, Defences of—Report of Colonel Jervois, Question, Lord Lyveden; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon; long debate thereon *Feb* 20, [177] 416; Observations, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald; Reply, Mr. Cardwell; long debate thereon *Mar* 13, 1539; Question, The Earl of Airlie; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *May* 5, [178] 1526; Letter of Colonel Jervois—*Parl. P.* [3434]

[*cont.*

British North America—cont.
Quebec, Defences of, Observations, Lord Elcho *Mar* 24, [178] 242; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 6, For Copy of Papers and Extracts of Correspondence relative to the proposed Canadian Defences and the share of the total cost which is to be respectively borne by Canada and the United Kingdom" (*Lord Elcho*), [178] 793; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 7, 892
Canada, Dismissal of Judge Coursol, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 10, [177] 137
Confederation, The, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 23, [178] 83; Observations, Mr. Cardwell *June* 19, [180] 439; Papers relating to the late Conferences presented [by Command]; to lie on the Table—*Parl. P.* No. [3426, 3535]
North West Territory, Question, Lord Wharncliffe; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 23, [177] 583
Railways, Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 24, [178] 234

British North American Steamship Company
Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 9, [177] 1368

BROMLEY, Mr. W. D., *Warwickshire, N.*
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [178] 533; Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. 758, 764
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 97
Union Chargeability, Consid. [179] 693
Westminster Improvement Commission, Returns moved for, [179] 211

BROUGHAM, Lord
Anti-Slavery Society, [180] 122
Partnership Amendment, Comm. [180] 253
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 179, [180] 852
Slave Trade Papers, [180] 333, 431; Explanation, 1025
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 20

BROWNE, Lord J. T., *Mayo Co.*
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 1514; Comm. [179] 980; *cl.* 9, 993; *add. cl.* 995
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 481
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 324
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 62
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 614
Supply—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, [179] 597, 599, 600; — Fishery Board (Scotland), 1307
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [178] 266

BRUCE, Right Hon. H. A. (Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education), *Merthyr Tydvil*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, [179] 298
Charitable Trusts Fees, 2R. [178] 1032
Charities, Vacant Inspectorship of, [180] 263
Education—Revised Code of Regulations, [177] 323, 328; Committee moved for, 894;—School Grants, [178] 1465;—Endowments for, Minute of Council, 1535, 1536, 1537
Endowed Grammar Schools, [180] 440
Grand Junction Canal Basin, [180] 1043
Science and Art Department, [177] 500
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 413, 416
Supply—Privy Council Office, [179] 608, 609;—Education, 1153, 1160, 1162;—Department of Science and Art, 1166, 1170, 1178, 1180
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 324; Consid. 667, 671, 683

BRUCE, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Belfast—Riots at, [177] 409
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. Preamble, [179] 985
Game (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1528; Comm. [179] 372
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 795;—Stipendiary Magistrates—Mr. Ffrench, 1476
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 615

BUCHANAN, Mr. W., *Glasgow*
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. Amendt. [177] 608
Writs Registration, &c. (Scotland), Leave, [177] 952

BUCKLEY, Lieut.-Gen. E. P., *Salisbury*
India—The Sixty-fourth Foot, [178] 1240

BULKELEY, Sir R. B. W., *Anglesey*
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 204

BULLER, Sir A. W., *Devonport*
Navy—Superannuation in the Dockyards, [177] 452

Burial Service, The
Question, Lord Ebury; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury *June* 23, [180] 707
Moved to resolve, That, in the opinion of this House, the Evils arising from the compulsory and almost indiscriminate use of the Burial Service of the Church of England demand the early attention of the Legislature (*Lord Ebury*) *July* 3, [180] 1026; Cont. 20, Not-Cont. 44; M. 23; Resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1033

BURLEIGH, Lord, *Northamptonshire, N.*
Militia—Reviews of the, [180] 538

BURRELL, Sir P., *New Shoreham*
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1097

BURY, Viscount (Treasurer of the Household), *Wick, &c.*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 124
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 505
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1660
Princess of Wales—Answer to Address, [180] 250
Wimbledon Common, Postponement of, 2R. [177] 498; 2R. [178] 769

BUTLER, Mr. C. S., *Tower Hamlets*
Powder Magazines, Government, [177] 135

BUTT, Mr. I., *Youghal*
Courts of Common Law (Ireland), [177] 847

BUXTON, Mr. C., *Maidstone*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1660
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 804
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 646
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 952
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1490
Saturday Half-holiday in Government Offices, [180] 633

CAIRD, Mr. J., *Stirling, &c.*
Agricultural Statistics, [178] 560
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1130
Export Duties (India), [178] 1600
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 815
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 264, 267
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 839, 844
Piers and Harbours (Scotland), [179] 921
Supply—Office of Woods, &c. [180] 479, 484

CAIRNS, Sir H. M., *Belfast*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [180] 992, 1013
Belfast—Riots at, [177] 320, 328, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 359, 360; Res. [180] 150
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 825
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1170; Comm. [179] 982, 983; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 986; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 988, 989, 990; *cl.* 7, 991; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 992, 994; *add. cl.* 996; Consid. *add. cl.* [180] 104; *cl.* 3, 105; *cl.* 4, 106
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 528
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 493
India—District Judges, [177] 203
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 761;—The Constabulary, [179] 1339, 1341
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 626
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 104
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 60

[*cont.*

Cairns, Sir H. M.—*cont.*
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 851, 853; Comm. 1182; *cl.* 14, [180] 88; *cl.* 40, 89
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1087, 1097; *cl.* 1, Amendt. [180] 46
Small Benefices (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 50

Caithness, Earl of
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 871

Cambridge, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Army — Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, [177] 1114

Campbell, Lord
Private Bills—Standing Orders, [180] 917
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 667

Canada—see *British North America*

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Burial Service, The, [180] 708, 709; Res. 1030
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [179] 873; Res. 1046
Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 699
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 657, 749

Cape of Good Hope—Long v. Bishop of Cape Town
Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18, [179] 486
The Kaffirs, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 29, [179] 976 — (see *British Kaffraria*)

Capital Punishments within Gaols Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Visct. Enfield*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 20 [Bill 30]
Bill withdrawn *June* 28, [180] 915

Cardigan, Earl of
Railway Passengers, 1R. [180] 108, 109

Cardwell, Right Hon. E. (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Oxford City*
Africa—Rumoured expedition against Ashantee, [177] 323;—Western Coast, Comm. moved for, 553
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1813, 1815;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 160
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [178] 1269
British Guiana—Coolies, [179] 1104
British Kaffraria, [177] 237; Leave, 312; Comm. 1098; *cl.* 17, 1099
British North American Colonies, [178] 83;—Red River Territory, [179] 977;—The Confederation, Papers presented, [180] 439
Canada—Dismissal of Judge Coursol, [177] 137;—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, 1165, 1595, 1596; Papers moved for, [178] 818, 845, 892;—Railways in, 235;—Fortifications in, [179] 114
[*cont.*

Cardwell, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
Canadian Delegates, [179] 1209
Cape Colony—The Kaffirs, [177] 976
China—Taxation at Hong Kong, [177] 1119
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 852
Colonial Bishops, [178] 783;—See of Rupert's Land, [179] 1100
Colonial Defences, [179] 1106
Colonial Governors (Retiring Allowances), [177] 119
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), [178] 959; Leave, 1514, 1517, 1519; 2R. [179] 1031, 1035; Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 513, 514; *cl.* 4, 665; *cl.* 12, 668, 669; *add. cl.* 670; 3R. 843
Colonial Naval Defence, Leave, [177] 1027, 1030; Comm. 1824
Colonies, Protection of the, [179] 911
Episcopal Church in the Colonies, [178] 276
Mauritius—Military Defence, [177] 1746
New Zealand—War in, [177] 289, 290, 1511, 1512, 1746, 1747;—Renewal of hostilities in, [178] 785, 893;—Affairs of, [179] 879;—Separation of Provinces, 1104
Roman Catholic Bishops, [180] 927
Supply, Report, Res. 9, [178] 360, 362;—Civil Service Estimates, 852;—Education (Ireland), [179] 1259;—Bermudas, 1281;—Labuan, 1281
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland) [180] 758
Transportation to Australia, [177] 137
United States—Passport System, [177] 661
Western Africa—War at Lagos, [179] 390

Carnarvon, Earl of
Companies Workmens' Education, Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 956
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 869; Nomination of Comm. [180] 7, 8
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [179] 192; Comm. 380
Prisons, 2R. [180] 519; Comm. *cl.* 68, Amendt. 853; Schedule 1, Amendt. 854; Schedule 2, 855
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 32, 33

Carnegie, Hon. C., *Forfarshire*
Army—Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 523
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. Adj. moved, [178] 1168, 1571

Carriers Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 16 [Bill 224]
Read 2° * *June* 19
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 22
Read 2ª * *June* 26 (No. 198)
Committee *; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 94]

Cartoons and Ornamental Screens at Hampton Court Palace—Petition
Observations, Lord St. Leonards *Mar* 31, [178] 556 ; Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck ; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 15, [179] 301 —(*Parl. P.* L. No. 84)

Casey, Alexander, Property of the late
Question, Colonel Vandeleur ; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 28, [178] 370

Cattle, Diseases in
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie ; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *Mar* 6, [177] 1117

Cattle Diseases Prevention Bill
Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise ; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 15, [179] 297

CAVE, Mr. S., *New Shoreham*
Africa—Western Coast, Comm. moved for, [177] 545
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1256
Banks of Issue, Res. [177] 154, 155
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1029 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [180] 663, 664
Colonial Naval Defence, Comm. [177] 1823
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1210
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. [179] 1314
Industrial Schools, Suspension of Standing Order, [178] 487
Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 604
Navy—Loss of the "Bombay," [180] 631
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1502
Oyster Fishery, [178] 672
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1286 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 526 ; *add. cl.* 534
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1839
Post Horse Duty, Exemption from, [178] 894
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 194
Prisons, Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1334
Slave Trade, [177] 846
Sugar Duties and Drawbacks, Re-Comm. [180] 516
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 476
Thames Embankment, [180] 633
Trinity Board—Steam Tugs, [177] 1117
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 337 ; *add. cl.* 521; Consid. 701
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1475
West India and Pacific Steam Ship Company's Mail Contract, [177] 1921
West India Postage Rate, [180] 46
Wrecks and Casualties, Abstract of, [177] 287

CAVENDISH, Lord, G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
Union Chargeability, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 524

CECIL, Lord R. T. G., (*see also* CRANBOURNE, Viscount) *Stamford*
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, Res. Amendt. [178] 1611 ; Comm. [179] 60
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. Adj. moved, [178] 1448, 1449
British North American Colonies, [178] 83
[*cont.*

CECIL, Lord R. T. G.—*cont.*
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1609
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 734, 736, 739, 741, 742, 851
Education—Revised Code of Regulations, [177] 327 ; Comm moved for, 902
India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 862
Ireland, State of, Res. [177] 717
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, [179] 490 ; Comm. moved for, 781
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, Consid. [178] 859
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1507 ;—Separation of Provinces, [179] 1104
Notices of Motion, &c. [177] 322
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 93
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. Amendt. [180] 210, 228
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 516
United States—Claims for compensation, [177] 1372 ; — Extradition Treaty with, 1537 ;— The "Alabama," [179] 1108

Certificates of Marriage, &c., Duties Repeal Bill
(*Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Blackburn*)
c. Ordered* *May* 23

Ceylon, Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks
Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 1, [179] 1130

Chain Cables and Anchors
Question, Mr. Laird ; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 9, [179] 46 ; Observations, Mr. Laird ; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson ; short debate thereon *June* 23, [180] 732

Chairman of Committees
The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of the House of Lords for this Session, [177] *Feb* 7

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord Westbury)
Abolition of Arrest on Final Process, 1R. [177] 1365, 1367
Affirmations (Scotland), 2R. [178] 2
Attorneys and Solicitors, 1R. [177] 634 ; 2R. 1466
Augmentation Act, Returns, [177] 225, 227
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1222, 1223
Bankruptcy, Court of, [177] 93
Clerical Subscription, Res. [179] 1046, 1050
Companies Workmens' Education, Comm. [179] 718
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [179] 180, 182
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 1R. [177] 486 ; 2R. 1038 ; 3R. [179] 108
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [178] 1171 ; Comm. 1310 ; 3R. *cl.* 16, 1579, 1580, 1582 ; [180] 252 ; Commons Amendts. 359
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *cl.* 14, [178] 1584 ; *add. cl.* 1585, 1586, 1588 ; Commons Amendts. [180] 357
[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR, The LORD—*cont.*
- Courts of Justice Site, [177] 415, 416; Returns moved for, 1914, 1919
- Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 555
- Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 193, 1532, 1533
- Edmunds, Leonard — Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1203, 1212, 1215, 1217, 1219, 1221
- Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 1726
- Johnson, Colonel, Case of, [178] 193, 1532, 1533
- Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1597
- Marriages (Lambourne), Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 189, 191
- Parliament — Lords Commissioners' Speech, [177] 2
- Partnership Amendment, 2R. [180] 118; Comm. *cl.* 5, 253; Report, 711, 716
- Patent Rights, [177] 635, 636
- Private Bill Costs, 2R. [178] 76; Res. *add. cl.* 484; 3R. Proviso, 768
- Reading Clerk and Clerk of Out-door Committees, [177] 317
- Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1453
- Resignation of — Personal Statement, [180] 1174
- Saffron Hill Murder—Case of Pelizzioni, [178] 486
- Standing Order No. 191 — Displacement of London Poor, Amendt. [178] 873, 874, 877
- Statutes Law Revision, 1R. [180] 430

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone), *Oxford University*
- African Merchant's Company, Subsidy to, [177] 748
- Army Estimates — Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, [178] 857;—Administration of the Army, 985
- Army—Salary of Dr. Sutherland, [180] 990
- Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 572
- Bank of Ireland, 2R. [177] 453
- Bank of Ireland (Consolidated Fund), Res. [177] 156
- Bank Notes (Ireland), 2R. [180] 605
- Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 616; Comm. 1909; [178] 1247; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1265, 1267, 1268; *add. cl.* 1270, 1272, 1273; 3R. Amendt. [179] 800; Re-Comm. 810; *cl.* 8, 815, 819, 821, 822, 823; Preamble, Amendt. 827; 3R. 1123
- Banks of Issue, Res. [177] 150, 154, 155
- Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [177] 1450
- British Museum, [177] 1534; [179] 488, 489
- Business, Public, [178] 1204
- Cape of Good Hope—Long *v.* Bishop of Cape Town, [179] 486, 487
- Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 420, 444
- Civil Service Estimates, [178] 736, 737, 740
- Collection of Taxes, [178] 669
- Collection of the Revenue in Scotland, [179] 236
- Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. [180] 284, 302
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [180] 675
- County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges Salaries), Res. [180] 528

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [180] 1212
- Dockyard Extensions, 2R. [179] 541; Comm. 949, 950; *cl.* 1, 951, 952, 1038
- Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 850
- Established Church Service — Rev. A. D. Wagner, Comm. moved for, [179] 770
- Financial Statement, [177] 1534;—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1084, 1142
- Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 37, 1467
- Government Annuities Act, [177] 238, 500, 959; [180] 823
- Greenwich Hospital, Consid. *cl.* 13, [180] 508
- Highway Contracts, Stamp Duty on, [180] 446
- Income Tax Papers, [178] 670
- India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 862
- Inland Revenue Acts, Comm. Res. (Malt), [179] 555; Res. 1 (Stamp Duties), 711; Res. 2, 712, 713; Res. 3, *ib.*; Res. 4, 714
- Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [180] 304; *cl.* 16, 305; *cl.* 25, 306; Preamble, 307, 308
- Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 204, 209, 211, 212, 374, 375, 377, 378
- Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 674;—Medical Officers in Unions, Res. 1519, 1522;—Railway System, Address moved, [178] 917; [180] 927
- Legacy and Succession Duty, [177] 134, 448
- Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 655
- Lotteries—Public Departments, [179] 1268
- Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 272, 275, 278, 280
- Man, Isle of, Disafforestation (Compensation), Comm. [177] 1458
- Marriage Certificates, Stamp Duties on, [179] 298
- Mileage Duty on Stage Carriages, [180] 261
- Navy—Dockyard Accommodation, [178] 1603
- New Museum of Natural History, [179] 876, 877
- North and South Shields, Ports of, [180] 1162
- Patent Office, Alleged irregularities in the, [177] 1123;—Accounts, [179] 637, 638
- Paymaster General and the Audit Office, [180] 628
- Pensions to Officers of the House of Lords, [177] 1370
- Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 204
- Post Office—Threepenny Postage Stamp, [177] 410
- Public Accounts, Committee of, [177] 321; Committee nominated, 455, 456
- Railway Legislation, [177] 232, 236, 237
- Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 613, 618
- Savings Banks and the National Debt, [180] 443, 444
- Science and Art Collections, [179] 1556, 1562, 1565
- Silver Coinage, [180] 262
- Sugar Duties and Drawbacks, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 28
- Supply—Redemption of the Scheldt Toll, [177] 1456;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, [179] 599;—Works and Public Buildings, 704;—Woods, Forests, &c. 707, 709;—Office of Works, &c. 943, 946, 947;—Printing and Stationery, 1144, 1145, 1146; — National Gallery, 1260, 1275; — Royal Academy of Music, 1280;—British Museum, 1353;—Post Office Department, 1359, 1360
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 217, 224
- Timber Duties, [177] 1480

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Tobacco, Home Grown, [180] 925
Union Chargeability, Consid. [179] 696
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 577, 583
University of Oxford, Election for the, [179] 50
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. Res. [178] 1084, 1142;—Tea, 1240, 1242, 1466, 1483, 1489, 1492, 1493; Amendt. 1500;—Income, 1501;—Fire Insurance, 1505, 1506, 1509, 1512; Report, Exchequer Bonds, 1710
Wines, Foreign, [179] 113

Chapter House, Westminster
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 18, [179] 488

Charitable Trusts Fees Bill
(*Mr. Hankey, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 10 [Bill 65]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Thomson Hankey*) *April* 25, [178] 1027
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir M. Peto*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster
Moved, "That the Digest of the Parochial Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster, referred to in the Eleventh and Twelfth Reports of the Charity Commissioners, be laid before the House" (*The Bishop of London*) *June* 23, [180] 705; after short debate, Motion agreed to—*Parl. P.* No. [3461]

CHARLEMONT, Earl of
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 7

CHEETHAM, Mr. J., *Salford*
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 12, [180] 669
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 681; *add. cl.* 684
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1654
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1899
United States—Consuls for the Southern States, [180] 368

CHELMSFORD, Lord
Abolition of Arrest on Final Process, 1R. [177] 1366
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [178] 1075; Papers moved for, [179] 726, 1043, 1044; [180] 109, 1145, 1155
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 33
Affirmations (Scotland), 2R. [178] 1
Attorneys and Solicitors, 2R. [177] 1471
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [177] 1222; Report, [178] 274

CHELMSFORD, Lord—*cont.*
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 695
Clerical Subscription, Report, [179] 1045, 1047; 3R. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1117
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [179] 181, 182
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [177] 1036
Courts of Justice Building, Comm. *cl.* 4, [178] 1313; 3R. *cl.* 16, 1582; [180] 251
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 31, 38, 718
Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 1725, 1727
Illicit Distillation in Clare and Donegal, Return moved for, [177] 281
Johnson, Colonel, Case of, [178] 1533
Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1597
Local Government Supplemental (No. 4), 2R. [180] 253
Marriages (Lambourne), Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 191
Navy — Captains on the Reserved List, [180] 975
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, [180] 252, 253; Report, 709; Amendt. 715, 716
Patent Rights, [177] 736
Penalties Law Amendment, 2R. [180] 968
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 114; *cl.* 5, 115
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 812
Salmon Fishery Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 40, Amendt. [180] 858
Standing Order No. 191—Displacement of London Poor, [178] 875
Winslow, Mr., Pension to, Explanation, [180] 1139

Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition Bill
(*Sir J. Shelley, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Locke*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 15
Read 1° * *Mar* 16 [Bill 74]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir J. Shelley*) *May* 1, [178] 1301
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, A. 27, N. 14; M. 13; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to the Select Committee on the Metropolitan Toll Bridges Bill—(see *Metropolitan Toll Bridges Bill*)

Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 21, [177] 490
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord R. Montagu*), 491; after debate, Question, "That 'now' &c.," A. 88, N. 118; M. 30; Bill put off for six months

Chemists and Druggists Bill
(*Sir F. Kelly, Mr. Kinglake, Sir S. Northcote*)
177] c. Resolution in Committee, 1910
Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 78
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir FitzRoy Kelly*) *Mar* 29, 470

Chemists and Druggists Bill—cont.
After debate, Bill read 2°, and committed to a 178] Select Committee, 479
And, on April 6, Select Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Baring (Chairman), Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Sir John Shelley, Lord Elcho, Mr. Brady, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Charles Wynn, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Cox, Mr. Schneider, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Charles Forster, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. Black
Report of Select Committee* *June* 19—(*Parl. P.* No. 381)

Chemists and Druggist (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir John Shelley, Mr. C. Forster, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Acts considered in Committee *Mar* 21, [178] 46
Ordered; read 1° after short debate *Mar* 21
Read 2°* *Mar* 29, and referred to the same Select Committee [Bill 84]
Report of Select Committee* *June* 19—(*Parl. P.* No. 381)

CHESTER, Bishop of
St. Titus Church, Liverpool, [179] 861

CHICHESTER, Earl of
Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 705
St. Titus Church, Liverpool, [179] 861

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Pontefract*
Dockyard Extensions, 2R. [179] 541, 1041
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1002, 1013; 2R. [179] 1011, 1012, 1017; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1316, 1317, 1318; *cl.* 10, 1319, 1320, 1322; *cl.* 11, 1324, 1325; *cl.* 14, 1326; *cl.* 20, [180] 125, 126; *cl.* 43, 127; *cl.* 51, 128; *add. cl.* 129, 130; Consid. *cl.* 13, Amendt. 499, 506
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Railway, 2R. [177] 1656
Navy—Chaplain General, [177] 1017;—Dockyard Accounts, 1018;—Wages in Dockyards, 1143;—Naval Chaplains, 1537;—Greenwich Hospital, 1923;—Chaplains' Quarterly Report, [178] 488;—Board of Admiralty, 712;—Case of Sir R. Bromley, [179] 1336;—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 394, 396, 397, 751;—Masters in the, 983
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1444;—Coast Guard Service, [178] 728;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 949, 952;—Wages to Artificers Abroad, 954;—Miscellaneous Services, 955;—Naval Stores, 995;—New Works, &c. [179] 932, 942
Supply, Report, [178] 1039

China
British Subjects in the Chinese Service, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 16, [177] 287
British Subjects in, Observations, Colonel Sykes; Reply, The Attorney General *Mar* 20, 1945; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 6, [178] 782
Consular Courts in, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 23, [178] 81
[*cont.*

China—cont.
Dismissal of Prince Kung, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 2, [179] 1209
Foreign Vessels under the Chinese Flag, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 20, [180] 539
Indian Allowances in, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 81
Piracy in, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 7, [178] 888
Proceedings in, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 1, [178] 1239
Taxation at Hong Kong, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 6, [177] 1119

Church Attendance on Sunday Bill
(*Mr. Clifford, Mr. A. Russell, Mr. S. Lefevre*)
c. Resolution in Committee *Mar* 1, [177] 946
Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 1 [Bill 46]
Bill withdrawn* *Mar* 13

Church Establishment (*Ireland*)
Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the present position of the Irish Church Establishment is unsatisfactory, and calls for the early attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *Mar* 28, [178] 384; after long debate, Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Goschen*); A. 221, N. 106; M. 115; Debate adjourned till Tuesday 2nd May; Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Mr. Dillwyn *April* 28, 1204

Church of England
Burial Service, Moved to resolve, That, in the opinion of this House, the Evils arising from the Compulsory and almost indiscriminate use of the Burial Service of the Church of England demand the early attention of the Legislature (*Lord Ebury*) *July* 3, [180] 1026; On Question? Cont. 20, Not-Cont., 43; M. 23; Resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1033
Confession in the—Law of Evidence—Case of Constance Kent, Questions, The Marquess of Westmeath *May* 12, [179] 177; long debate thereon
Convocation of Canterbury—Alteration of the Canons, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 8, [179] 1269; Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 16, [180] 369
Ecclesiastical Commission, The, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 3, [180] 1044
Episcopal Church in the Colonies, Question, Mr. Dunlop; Answers, Mr. Cardwell, The Attorney General *Mar* 27, [178] 275
Episcopal Residence at Bristol, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 22, [180] 632
Episcopate, Increase of the, Petition presented by Lord Lyttelton *June* 23, [180] 696; after debate, Petition read and ordered to lie on the table
[*cont.*

Church of England—cont.

Established Church Service—The Rev. A. D. Wagner, Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report to this House as to the mode in which the service of the Established Church is administered at the church of St. Paul's, Brighton," &c. (*Mr. Whalley*) *May* 23, [179] 767; after debate, Question put, and negatived

Exeter, The Diocese of, Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 7, [178] 931

Illegal Usages and Ornaments — Auricular Confession, Moved, and after short debate *May* 23 Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the means of enforcing the Law as to illegal usages and ornaments in the Church of England, and especially in respect of the practice of Auricular confession (*Mr. Whalley*), [179] 774

Liturgy, Revision of the, Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 1, [179] 1122

Minor Canons, &c., Observations, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Reply, Sir George Grey *June* 30, [180] 984

St. Alban's, Holborn, Services at, Observations, The Marquess of Westmeath; long debate thereon *June* 16, [180] 334

Church Rates Commutation Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Lord Robert Montagu*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 35]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Newdegate*) *May* 10, [179] 74
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir C. Douglas*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after long debate, A. 42, N. 126; M. 84; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; second reading put off for six months; Division list, 96

Churches and Chapels Exemption (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland, Mr. Adam*)

c. Ordered *May* 11, [179] 173
Read 1° *May* 15, 373 [Bill 147]
Read 2° * *May* 18
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 29
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 128)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 62]

CHURCHILL, Lord A. S., *Woodstock*
Africa—Western Coast, Comm. moved for, [177] 547
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [178] 367
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1503

CHURSTON, Lord
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 3R. [179] 1116

Civil Bill Courts Procedure (Ireland) Act (1864) Amendment Bill
(*Sir R. Peel, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 17 [Bill 29]
Read 2° * *Feb* 20
Committee *; Report *Feb* 21
Considered * *Feb* 22
Read 3° * *Feb* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *Feb* 24 (No. 16)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *Feb* 28
Read 3ª * *Mar* 2
Royal Assent *Mar* 3 [28 *Vict.* c. 1]

Civil Service Estimates
Question, Mr. Augustus Smith; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 17, [177] 1906
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "the Civil Service Estimates be referred to a Select Committee for examination, and to report thereon, in respect of each Class separately, such matters as may appear to them specially to deserve the attention of the House" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*), [178] 717; Question, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn; Observations, Mr. Augustus Smith *May* 19, [179] 593

CLANCARTY, Earl of
Ireland—Poor Law Unions, [180] 432

CLANRICARDE, Marquess of
Army—Barracks (Ireland), [177] 1461, 1462
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. [177] 1645; Report, [178] 274; Commons Amendts. 1306
Brazil and Uruguay—The River Plate, [177] 1367
Fisheries Commissioners, Chairman of the, [180] 349
India—Titles to Land, [180] 1038
Ireland—Public Records relating to, [177] 741; —Curragh of Kildare, [178] 869
Jackson, Mr., Claims of, [180] 974
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 921
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [179] 1116; Comm. [180] 112; *cl.* 5, 114, 115; Report, Amendt. 515, 518
Railway Passengers, 1R. [180] 109, 433
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1457
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [177] 734, 735
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 810
Shannon River, Nomination of Comm. [179] 628
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [179] 5

CLARENDON, Earl of (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster)
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 632, 655, 667, 668, 746; Select Comm. 1304, 1305; Nomination of Comm. 1458
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 32

Clare's Patents
Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 20, [177] 449

Clay, Mr. J., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Agency Money—Consul General at St. Petersburg, [177] 234
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 572
Bank Notes Issue, 3R. [179] 806 ; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, 824
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1210
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 17, Amendt. [180] 533
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1198
Russia Company Dues, [177] 234
Supply — Consular Establishments Abroad, Amendt. [179] 1282, 1283, 1284, 1285

Clerical Subscription
Clerical Subscription considered in Committee (*Sir George Grey*) *May* 8, [178] 1710 [House counted out]

Clerical Subscription Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
179] *l.* Presented ; read 1ª *May* 19, 560
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 26 (No. 111)
. Read 2ª, after short debate, 872
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *May* 29, 959 (No. 132)
: Amendt. (*The Archbishop of Dublin*) ; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; House in Committee, 962
. Amendts. reported *May* 30, 1045 (No. 138)
. Read 3ª *June* 1 ; Amendts. made ; Bill passed, 1117 (No. 230)
. Protest against the third reading, 1118
180] *c.* Read 1° * *June* 2 [Bill 199]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir George Grey*) *June* 22, 634 ; after long debate, Question put, and agreed to ; Read 2°
. Moved, "That the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill" *June* 26, 837 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
. Committee ; Report, 839
. Considered as amended *June* 27, 879
Read 3° * *June* 28
l. Commons Amendts. considered *June* 29, 924
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 122]

Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, Office of
On Feb 10, Committee appointed as follows :—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Richmond, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Carnarvon, E. Malmesbury, E. Chichester, Ld. Chamberlain, V. Eversley, L. Willoughby de Eresby, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Wynford, L. Cranworth, L. Chelmsford
Report of Select Committee *Feb* 17
Second Report *May* 23—(*Parl. P.* No. 120)
Third Report *July* 4—(*Parl. P.* No. 253)

Cleveland, Duke of
Local Government Supplemental (No. 4), 2R. [180] 255
Museums, &c. Public, [180] 970
Private Bill Costs, 3R. *add. cl.* [178] 767, 768
Sewage Utilization, Comm. [179] 629
Union Chargeability, Comm. [180] 356

Clifford, Mr. C. C., *Isle of Wight*
Church Attendance on Sunday, Leave, [177] 946
Cowes Trinity Pilots, [177] 600
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 131

Clifton, Sir R. J., *Nottingham*
Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 43
Master Manufacturers—Rental on Machinery, [180] 540
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 553
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 343
University of Oxford, Election for the, [179] 50

Cobbold, Mr. J. C., *Ipswich*
Bank Notes Issue, 3R. [179] 810 ; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. 811, 827
India—Army Promotion, [180] 259

Cobden, Mr., The Late
Observations, Viscount Palmerston, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Bright *April* 3, [178] 673

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. Baillie, *Honiton*
Canada—Fortifications in, [179] 114
Ceylon—Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks, [179] 1130, 1133
Colonial Governors Retiring Allowances, [177] 119 ; [178] 959
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1019, 1033, 1035 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 514
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1196
Indian Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 396
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 202, 211, 212 ; Explanation, 372, 373, 374, 375
Ireland—Administration of Justice, [177] 1829
Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 195
Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the, [179] 212
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1302
Railways (Guards and Passengers Communication), Comm. [179] 65
Supply—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 496

Cogan, Mr. W. H. F., *Kildare Co.*
Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [177] 1972
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 454
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 21, [179] 716 ; Consid. *cl.* 21, Amendt. 859
Ireland—County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 197, 198
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 854

Colchester, Lord
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1221
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [180] 857

Cole, Hon. H. A., *Fermanagh Co.*
India—Pegu Prize Money, [178] 783

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire*
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 621
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 869
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1195
Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. Amendt. [178] 194

Collier, Sir R. P., *see* Solicitor General The

Collins, Mr. T., *Knaresborough*
Borough Franchise Extension, [177] 957
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 92
County Voters Registration, Leave, [177] 1364; Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 99; *cl.* 12, 100; *add. cl.* 102
Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. [180] 615
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 552, 554
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 473; Comm. 615, 617
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1019
Wakefield Gaol, [177] 1091

Colonial Docks Loans Bill
(*Lord C. Paget, Mr. Childers*)
c. Considered in Committee * *June* 15
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *June* 16 [Bill 226]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Lord Clarence Paget*) *June* 20, [180] 595; after short debate, Read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 26
Considered as amended * *June* 27
Read 3°* *June* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *June* 28
Read 2ª* *June* 29 (No. 231)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 106]

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. C. Fortescue*)
178] *c.* Considered in Committee *May* 4
Resolution (*Mr. Cardwell*) agreed to, 1519
Resolution [May 4] reported; Bill ordered* *May* 5
Read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 133]
179] Read 2° after long debate *May* 29, 1019
180] Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 19, 512; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill considered in Committee, 513—R.P.
Committee; Report *June* 22, 663
Considered as amended *June* 23, 760
Read 3° after short debate *June* 26, 841
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 26 (No. 225)
[*cont.*

Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions) Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, 964; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3ª* *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 113]

Colonial Laws Validity Bill
(*Mr. C. Fortescue, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *May* 29, [179] 1042
Read 2°* *June* 12 [Bill 183]
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3°* *June* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 15
Read 2ª* *June* 19 (No. 158)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª* *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 63]

Colonial Marriages Validity Bill
(*Mr. C. Fortescue, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *May* 29, [179] 1042
Read 2°* *June* 12 [Bill 184]
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3°* *June* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 15
Read 2ª* *June* 19 (No. 159)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª* *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 64]

Colonial Naval Defence Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. C. Fortescue*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 2; Read 1°* *Mar* 6 [Bill 51]
Read 2°* *Mar* 13
Committee; Report after short debate *Mar* 16, [177] 1823
Read 3°* *Mar* 17
l. Read 1ª* (*Duke of Somerset*) *Mar* 20 (No. 39)
Read 2ª after debate *Mar* 27, [178] 272
Committee *; Report *Mar* 28
Read 3ª *Mar* 30, 484
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 14]

Colonies
Africa (*Western Coast*), Select Committee appointed and nominated—see *Africa*
Australia, Transportation to, Question, Mr. Moor; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 10, [177] 137; Petitions (*Lord Taunton*) *Feb* 27, 737
British Kaffraria, Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 14, [177] 237
Cape of Good Hope—Long v. Bishop of Cape Town, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 18, [179] 486
Colonial Bishops, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 6, [178] 783
Colonial Defences, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [179] 1105
[*cont.*

COLONIES—*cont.*
Colonial Governors' Retiring Allowances, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 9, [177] 119; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 24, [178] 959
Episcopal Church in the, Question, Mr. Dunlop; Answers, Mr. Cardwell, The Attorney General *Mar* 27, [178] 275
Mauritius, The—Contribution for Military Defence, Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, [177] 1742
Protection of the, Observations, Mr. Marsh; Answer, Mr. Cardwell; debate thereon *May* 26, [179] 905
Rupert's Land, See of, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [179] 1100

Commercial Treaty with France
Question, Mr. Treherne; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 16, [177] 1748 — *Importation of Salt into,* Question, Mr. J. Tollemache; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 15, [179] 292

Commissionaires, Band of the
Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 2, [178] 1316

Commissioners of Supply Meetings (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Finlay, Sir G. Montgomery, Sir W. Scott*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *April* 3, [178] 743 [Bill 102]
Read 2° * *April* 6
Committee *; Report *May* 10
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 19 [Bill 136]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Airlie*) *May* 22
Read 2ª * *May* 30 (No. 118)
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Read 3ª * *June* 2
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 38]

Commissioners of Supply (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Finlay, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 5 [Bill 104]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 10

Committee of Selection
On Feb 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Lord Hotham, Mr. Mowbray, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders
Special Report *June* 15, [180] 259

Common Law Courts (Fees) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Resolution * *Feb* 21
Bill ordered * *Feb* 22
Read 1° * *Feb* 23 [Bill 39]
Read 2° * *Feb* 27
Committee *; Report *Mar* 1
Considered * *Mar* 3 [Bill 174]
Read 3° * *Mar* 6
[*cont.*

Common Law Courts (Fees) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Mar* 7
Read 2ª * *May* 1 (No. 25)
Committee *; Report *May* 4
Read 3ª * *May* 5 (No. 140)
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 45]

Commons and Open Spaces (Metropolis)
After debate, on Motion of *Mr. Doulton,* Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the best means of preserving for the public use the Forests, Commons, and Open Spaces in and around the Metropolis" *Feb* 21, [177] 502
And, on March 3, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Locke (Chairman), Mr. Doulton, Mr. Cowper, Viscount Bury, Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Du Cane, Mr. Henry Baillie, Sir John Shelley, Mr. John Tollemache, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Peacocke, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Vance, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Torrens, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. Alderman Rose, and Mr. Cox
Report of Select Committee *April* 3, [178]—(*Parl. P.* No. 178)

Companies Workmens' Education Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Archbishop of York*)
179] Presented; read 1ª * *May* 11 (No. 102)
Read 2ª *May* 18, 483
. Considered in Committee *May* 23, 718
. Amendts. reported *May* 29, 953 (No. 121)
. Moved to omit Clause 1, and insert another Clause in lieu thereof (*The Lord President*), 953
. On Question, that Clause 1 stand Part of the Bill; Cont. 53, Not-Cont. 38; M. 15; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 956
. Read 3ª after debate *May* 30, 1045 (No. 131)
c. Read 1° * *June* 12 [Bill 191]
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley, [180] 446
Order for second reading read and discharged; Bill withdrawn *June* 19

Compound Spirits Warehousing Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Considered in Committee; Ordered * *June* 20
Presented; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 233]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Committee * Report *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 224)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 98]

Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 12 [Bill 208]
180] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *June* 15, 284
. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Lord Robert Montagu*), 296; Question, "That 'now,' &c.;"
[*cont.*

Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit Bill—cont.
after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Read 2°
Committee*; Report *June* 19 [Bill 228]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 22
Read 3°* *June* 23
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *June* 23
Read 2ª* *June* 27 (No. 212)
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª* *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 93]

Confederate States
Beale, Captain, Case of, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 13, [177] 1536
British Property in the, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 20, [177] 1922

Consolidated Fund (£175,650) Bill
c. Resolution in Committee of Ways and Means *Mar* 13
Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14
Read 2°* *Mar* 16
Committee*; Report *Mar* 17
Read 3°* Mar 20
l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 21; Read 2ª* *Mar* 23
Committee negatived
Read 3ª* *Mar* 24
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [28 *Vict.* c. 4]

Consolidated Fund (£15,000,000) Bill
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 24; Read 2°* *Mar* 27
Committee*; Report *Mar* 28
Read 3°* *Mar* 29
l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 30; Read 2ª* *Mar* 31
Committee negatived
Read 3ª* *April* 3
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 10]

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
180] *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 21
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 22 670; after debate, Read 2°
. Committee; Report *June* 23, 717
. Read 3° after short debate *June* 26, 825
l. Read 1ª* *June* 26
Read 2ª* *June* 29
Committee* Report *July* 3
Read 3ª* *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 6 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 123]

Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill (*Sir Robert Peel, Sir G. Grey*)
178] *c.* Ordered; read 1° after debate *April* 27, 1168 [Bill 122]
. Read 2° after short debate *May* 4, 1512
179] Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 29, 978
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. William Ormsby Gore*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee; after long debate, Bill reported *May* 29
[*cont.*

Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill—cont.
180] Considered as amended *June* 12, 104
Read 3°* *June* 15 [Bill 178]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Dufferin*) *June* 16
Read 2ª* *June* 23 (No. 168)
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 70]

Constance Kent—Case of
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9 [179] 48
See also *Church of England—Confession in*

Consular Reports
Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 21, [178] 8

Controverted Elections
General Committee of Elections (*By Mr. Speaker's Warrant*) *Feb* 9, [177] 127; Rt. Hon. Sir Francis Thornhill Baring (Chairman), Rt. Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole, Rt. Hon. Lord Athlumney, Sir William Miles, Mr. George Ward Hunt, Mr. John Bonham-Carter; Chairman's Panel *Feb* 23, 589; Mr. William Edward Baxter, Mr. James Wentworth Buller, Mr. Edward C. Egerton, Mr. Thomas William Evans, Mr. James Milnes Gaskell, Mr. Robert Longfield; Report from the General Committee of Elections; Francis Charles Hastings Russell, esq. added in the room of James Wentworth Buller, esq., deceased

Conventual Establishments
Question, Mr. Hennessy; Explanation, Mr. Newdegate *Mar* 13, [177] 1637

Cork, Earl of
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), 2R. [179] 1044
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. [180] 522
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257

Coroners (Ireland) Bill
(*Colonel Dickson, Mr. Hennessy*)
c. Ordered* *May* 18
Read 1° after short debate *May* 19, [179] 620 [Bill 161]

Corry, Rt. Hon. H. T. L., *Tyrone, Co.*
Dockyard Extensions, Comm. [179] 949, 950, 1039
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 1322; *cl.* 11, 1324; *cl.* 51, [180] 128; *add. cl.* 129
Naval Reserve, [180] 738
Navy Estimates, [179] 487;—New Works, &c. 922, 934
Navy—Recruits for the Marines, [179] 641; —Masters in the, 878; [180] 983; — Dockyard Superintendents, Res. 393

Cotton Manufacturing Districts, Distress in the—Mr. Farnall
Observations, Earl Fortescue; short debate thereon *Feb* 23, [177] 580

County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
177] *l.* Presented; read 1ª after short debate *Feb* 21, 486 (No. 9)
. Read 2ª after debate *Mar* 3, 1030; and referred to a Select Committee
And, on March 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Steward, E. Devon, E. Romney, V. Eversley, L. Cranworth, L. Saint Leonards, L. Wensleydale, L. Belper, L. Chelmsford, L. Kingsdown, L. Lyveden
Report of Select Committee * *May* 4 (No. 81)
Report * *May* 4 (No. 82)
Committee * *May* 8; Report * *May* 9 (No. 94)
179] Read 3ª after debate, and passed *May* 11, 106 (Nos. 98 & 210)
c. Read 1° * *May* 16 [Bill 150]
. Read 2° after debate *May* 25, 855
180] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to assimilate the Sheriffs' Court of the City of London in all respects to a County Court" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *June* 22, 679; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
. Committee; Report *June* 22, 681 [Bill 236]
; Considered as amended *June* 26, 847
Read 3° * *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 99]

County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries)
Considered in Committee *June* 20, [180] 527
Moved, "That provision be made for the payment out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland of the sum of Three Hundred Pounds per annum to each of the Judges of the County Courts, in addition to their present salary" (*Mr. Peel*); Motion agreed to; Resolution to be reported tomorrow
Resolution reported and agreed to * *June* 21

County Infirmaries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *May* 15, [179] 374 [Bill 148]

County of Sussex Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Colonel Barttelot, Mr. Cobbett*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10, [179] [Bill 138]
Read 2° * *May* 12
Committee *; Report *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Chichester*) *May* 19
Read 2ª * *May* 26 (No. 114)
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Read 3ª * *May* 30
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 37]

County Voters Registration Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Walter, Mr. Howes*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 8, [177] 1363 [Bill 59]
Read 2° * *Mar* 30
Moved, "An Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to extend the provisions of the Bill relating to the powers and duties of revising barristers to the [*cont.*

County Voters Registration Bill—cont.
case of registration in cities and boroughs" (*Mr. Hunt*) *May* 10, [179] 98
Motion agreed to; Considered in Committee, and reported [Bill 135]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 18
Read 3° * *May* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 22
Read 2ª * *May* 26 (No. 116)
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Read 3ª * *May* 30
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 36]

County Voters, Registration of
Question, Mr. Western; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *Mar* 10, [177] 1475

County Voters Registration (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Robert Peel, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 70]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir R. Peel*) *Mar* 24, [178] 265
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bagwell*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 30, N. 32; M. 2; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; second reading put off for six months

Coursol, Judge, Dismissal of
Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 10, [177] 137

COURTENAY, Lord, *Exeter*
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 593

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Robert Peel, Sir Colman O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 6]
Read 2° * *Mar* 3
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 30, [178] 500
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Whiteside*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, A. 68, N. 30; M. 38
Considered in Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *June* 15

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill
Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 7, [178] 894

Court of Chancery (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Whiteside, Mr. George*)
c. Ordered; after debate read 1° *Feb* 16, [177] 307 [Bill 25]
Read 2° after short debate *Mar* 2, 1027
Bill withdrawn * *June* 1

Court of Chancery (Ireland) (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Whiteside, Mr. George*)

c. Ordered * *Feb* 20 ; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 38]
Read 2° after short debate *Mar* 2, 1027
Bill withdrawn * *June* 1

Court of Chancery (Ireland) [Salary, Retired Allowances, and Stamps]
Considered in Committee * *April* 5
Resolution reported * *April* 6

Court of Probate
Question, Mr. John Locke ; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 23, [178] 86

Courts of Conciliation
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Mackinnon *Mar* 30, [178] 489

Courts of Justice Building Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Cowper, Mr. Solicitor General*)

177] *c.* Ordered ; read 1° after long debate *Feb* 10, 157 [Bill 5]
. Read 2° after debate *Feb* 16, 290
Order for Committee read
. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," 601
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day month, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Sir Henry Willoughby*) ; after short debate, main Question agreed to
Bill considered in Committee, and reported *Feb* 23
Considered * *Feb* 27
. Read 3° *Mar* 2, 1026
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Mar* 3
178] Read 2ª after debate *April* 28, 1171 (No. 23)
. Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*) *May* 2, 1308
. Amendt. To leave out from ("That") and insert ("the Courts of Justice Building Bill and the Courts of Justice Concentration (Site) Bill be referred to a Select Committee, such Committee to inquire and report as to the probable Cost of the new Courts and the Buildings connected therewith, and what new Approaches to the proposed Site will be required, and the probable Cost thereof") (*Lord Redesdale*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Cont. 55, Not-Cont. 32 ; M. 23 ; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1312
Considered in Committee, and reported without Amendment
. Protest against going into Committee, 1314
. Read 3ª after debate *May* 8, 1578
. Amendt. to leave out Clause 16 (*Lord St. Leonards*), 1578 ; after debate, Motion negatived
. Amendt. to leave out Clause 22 (*Lord St. Leonards*), 1581 ; on Question, "That the said clause stand part of the Bill ?" Cont. 46, Not-Cont. 47 ; M. 1 ; Clause struck out ; Bill passed
. List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1583

Courts of Justice Building Bill—cont.
179] *c.* Lords' Amendment considered ; and, after debate, disagreed to *June* 1, 1183 [Bill 172]
180] *l.* Commons Reasons for disagreeing to Lords' Amendment considered, 359 ; after short debate, on Question, "Whether to insist ?" Resolved in the negative *June* 16
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 48]

Courts of Justice Building Bill
Petition of Etheldreda Browning presented (*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *June* 15, [180] 251

Courts of Justice Building (Deficiencies, &c.)
c. Considered in Committee * *Feb* 21
Resolutions reported * *Feb* 22

Courts of Justice Concentration (Site) Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)

177] *c.* Ordered ; read 1° after short debate *Feb* 10, 198 [Bill 11]
. Read 2° *Feb* 23, and committed to a Select Committee, 607
And, on Feb 24, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Cowper (Chairman), Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Murray, Mr. H. B. Baring, Mr. E. P. Bouverie, Mr. Gaskell
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Courts of Justice Concentration (Site) Bill, that they have power to make provision for appropriating or obtaining sites, and for the erection of lodging-houses or other suitable dwellings for the working classes proposed to be displaced by the said Bill" (*Mr. Kinnaird*) *Feb* 28, 926
. Amendt. to leave out "make," and insert "inquire into the practicability and expediency of making" (*Mr. Hennessy*) ; Question, "That the word 'make' &c. ;" A. 18, N. 8 ; M. 10
Report * *Mar* 14—(*Parl. P.* No. 124)
Order for Committee on Re-Comm. read
. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 23, 178 ; after debate, Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 30, 489
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee, and that they be instructed to inquire into the capabilities of the Thames Embankment as a site for the proposed buildings" (*Mr. Lygon*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after further debate, Question put, and agreed to
Considered in Committee, and reported *Mar* 30
Read 3° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 71]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *April* 3 (No. 56)
Read 2ª * *April* 28
Reported specially * *May* 1
Committee * ; Report *May* 2 (No. 141)
. Read 3ª after short debate *May* 8, 1584
. Amendt. in Clause 14, to leave out "Bridges over or" (*Lord St. Leonards*), 1584 ; Amendt. negatived

Courts of Justice Concentration (*Site*) *Bill*—cont.
Moved, after Clause 18, to insert new clause (*Lord St. Leonards*); after debate, Cont. 47, Not-Cont. 44; M. 3; Clause added; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1588
Protest against the third reading, 1589
Protest against the insertion of the words "Bridges over or" in Clause 14, 1595—(*Parl. P.* No. 74)
179] *c.* Lords' Amendment considered; and, after debate, agreed to, with an Amendment *June* 1, 1184 [Bill 173]
180] *l.* Commons Amendment to Lords Amendment considered *June* 16; after short debate, Motion agreed to, 357
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 49]

Courts of Justice Site
Question, Mr. Walter; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 13, [177] 208
Returns, Observations, The Earl of Longford *Feb* 20, [177] 415

Courts of Justice, The New
Moved, That there be laid before the House, "Copies of the Plan or Plans which have been suggested for the Site and Buildings of the proposed Courts of Justice; And also, Return of the Number of Houses and of the Names of the Streets, Lanes, and Places, and Courts comprised in the Site to be purchased for the purposes of the same" (*Earl Stanhope*), [177] 1910; after debate, Motion withdrawn *Mar* 20

COWPER, Earl
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1033, 1037

COWPER, Right Hon. W. F. (Chief Commissioner of Works), *Hertford*
British Museum, Enlargement of the, [179] 390, 391, 392
Cartoons at Hampton Court Palace, [179] 301
Chapter House, Westminster, [179] 488
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. [178] 1302
Commissionaires, Band of the, [178] 1316
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 508
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Leave, [177] 196, 208; 2R. 607; Instruction to Comm. 929; Comm. [178] 180, 497; *cl.* 3, 500
Hyde Park—Gardens in, [177] 1830
Leicester Square, [177] 1369
Metropolis—Park Lane, [178] 890
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 844
New Palace Yard, Extension of, [177] 498
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 594
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1301, 1304, 1305, 1307
Regent's Park—Bridge over the Canal, [177] 600
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1547, 1554
Supply—Public Buildings, [179] 242;—Royal Parks, 245, 246;—New Houses of Parliament, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252;—Probate Court and Registries, 253;—Public Records Repository, 253;—New Westminster Bridge, 254;

[cont.

COWPER, Right Hon. W. F.—*cont.*
—Nelson Column, 255;—Patent Office, 255, 256;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 259;—Public Offices Site, 259; Report, 371;—Office of Works, &c. 943, 944, 945, 946, 948;—National Gallery, 1271, 1273;—British Historical Portrait Gallery, 1276;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 484, 494, 495, 496
University of London, [177] 1479; [179] 1214
Wellington, Duke of, Monument at St. Paul's, [178] 80
Westminster Bridge, [177] 208
Westminster Palace Crypt, [178] 1469
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 780

COX, Mr. W., *Finsbury*
Army Estimates — Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1990
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic—Forged Signatures, Report, [177] 1736; Comm. [179] 59; Report, 1237, 1238, 1246
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 736, 739, 740,
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 514
Craythorne, Walter, Case of, [179] 1335
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 21, [179] 859
Inclosure, 2R. Amendt. [178] 540
India—Central Indian Prize Money, [177] 209
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 612
Metropolitan Police Rate, [177] 1900
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [178] 366; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 368
Navy Estimates—New Works, &c. [179] 940
Patent Laws, The—Hon. R. Bethell, [179] 392
Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment, Leave, [177] 251, 256; [178] 488, 489; 2R. 863; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 543, 549, 551, 552
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [179] 1263
Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. Adj. moved, [179] 705, 708; [180] 481;—Office of Works, &c. [179] 945;—Department of Science and Art, 1172, 1174, 1176;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1304;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1310;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 496
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Comm. Adj. moved, [178] 956
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 689, 846
Upper Street, Islington, Disgraceful State of, [179] 238, 241
Wimbledon Common, 2R. Amendt. [178] 775

CRANBOURNE Viscount—(*see also* CECIL, Lord R.,) *Stamford*
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 874, 875
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 906, 907, 908; Res. 1118

CRANWORTH, Lord
Attorneys and Solicitors, 2R. [177] 1473
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [177] 1222; Report, [178] 274; Commons Amendts. 1305
Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 974

[cont.

CRANWORTH, Lord—*cont.*
- County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [177] 1035
- Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [178] 1190
- Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 45
- Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 1726, 1727
- India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 277
- Local Government Supplemental (No. 4), 2R. [180] 255
- Patent Rights, [177] 636
- Partnership Amendment, 2R. [180] 118; Comm. *cl.* 5, 253

CRAUFURD, Mr. E. H. J., *Ayr, &c.*
- Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 576
- Collection of the Revenue in Scotland, [179] 233
- County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 855
- Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 196
- Private Bills—Printing Petitions, Res. [177] 285
- Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 554
- Supply—New Houses of Parliament, [179] 251
- Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [178] 1165, 1572

CRAWFORD, Mr. R. W., *London*
- British India and Colonial Trust, &c. Corporation, [180] 925
- Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 499
- Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 42
- India—Export Duties, [178] 1600;—The Loan, 1601
- Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. Amendt. [177] 835, 845
- Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 565
- Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 547
- St. Benet, Gracechurch Street, and Allhallows, Lombard Street, [177] 321
- Shannon River, Nomination of Comm. Adj. moved, [179] 555
- Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [179] 1360
- Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1460
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1482
- Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1207

Craythorne, Case of Walter
- Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 9, [179] 1335

Criminal Cases (Evidence) Bill
(*Mr. Scully, Mr. McMahon*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 10 [Bill 8]
- Second Reading deferred *Mar* 1, [177] 945

CRIMINAL LAW
- *Atkinson, Matthew, Execution at Durham of,* Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 21, [178] 7
- *Australia, Transportation to,* Question, Mr. Moor; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 10, [177] 137; Petitions (*Lord Taunton*) *Feb* 27, 737

[*cont.*

CRIMINAL LAW—*cont.*
- *Forfeitures on Conviction of Felony,* Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 13, [177] 205
- *Gaols, Flogging in,* Questions, Mr. Scully, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 77
- *Kent, Constance—Case of,* Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9, [179] 48
- *Newgate, Executions at,* Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 4, [178] 1465
- *Newgate, Treatment of Prisoners in,* Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 23, [177] 599; Observations, Mr. Locke; Reply, Sir George Grey *Mar* 2, 1022
- *Saffron Hill Murder,* Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 13, [177] 209—*Case of Pellizioni,* Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 84; Question, Lord Houghton; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 30, 484
- *Wakefield Gaol,* Observations, Mr. Neate; debate thereon *Mar* 3, [177] 1087

CROSSLEY, Sir F., *Yorkshire, W. R.*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 76
- Financial Statement, Comm. Res. [178] 1143
- Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 535
- Supply — Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, Amendt. [179] 1299
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, [178] 1511

Crown Suits, &c., Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir G. Grey, Mr. Solicitor General*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 12 [Bill 146]
- Read 2°* *May* 29
- Committee*; Report *June* 12
- Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 15—R.P.
- Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 16 [Bill 206]
- Read 3°* *June* 19
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 20
- Read 2ª* *June* 29 (No. 187)
- Committee*; Report *June* 30
- Read 3ª* *July* 3
- Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 144]

Crown Suits, &c., Bill
- Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 18, [179] 490

Custom House Charges
- Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 12, [180] 45

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill
- *c.* Read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 129]
- Read 2°* *May* 11
- Committee*; Report *May* 12
- Read 3°* *May* 15
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 16
- Read 2ª* *May* 18 (No. 105)
- Committee*; Report *May* 19
- Read 3ª* *May* 22 (No. 221)
- Royal Assent *May* 26 [28 *Vict.* c. 30]

Customs, Out-Door Officers of
Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Peel *April* 3, [178] 669
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the grievances referred to in the Petition of the Mayor, Merchants, Shipowners, and Commercial Traders of Liverpool (*Mr. Hennessy*), [178] 1205; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, A. 80, N. 69; M. 11

Dalglish, Mr. R., *Glasgow*
Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 195
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 394

Dalhousie, Earl of
Colonial Naval Defence, 3R. [178] 484

Damer, Mr. L. S. D., *Portarlington*
Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [177] 1822
Dogs, Ownerless, [180] 365
Navy—Captain Coles' Cupola, [177] 1661
Thames, The, at Hampton Court, [178] 79

Dartmouth, Earl of
Railway Passengers, 1R. [180] 107

Dawson, Mr. R. P., *Londonderry Co.*
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. [179] 979
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 688;—The Constabulary and the Game Licences, 1923;—Mail Service, [179] 1099
Leicester Square, [177] 1368
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1255

Defence Act (1860) Amendment Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, Viscount Palmerston*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 176]
Read 2° * *June* 2
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 13
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 152)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 65]

De Grey and Ripon, Earl (Secretary of State for War)
Army—Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, [177] 1107, 1113;—Barracks (Ireland), 1462;—Issue of Commissions, [180] 972, 973
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 422, 423, 424, 429, 439; [178] 1530
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [180] 964
Hymn Book for the Army and Navy, [180] 860
India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 285
[*cont.*

De Grey and Ripon, Earl—*cont.*
Ireland—Curragh of Kildare, [178] 869
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [179] 192; Comm. 378
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 920
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 114; *cl.* 5, 115

Denison, Rt. Hon. J. E., *see* Speaker, The

Denman, Lord
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Commons Amendts. [180] 358
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 3R. Amendt. [179] 1115
Penalties Law Amendment, 2R. [180] 968, 969; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1144; 3R. Amendt. *ib*
Sewage Utilization, Comm. [179] 628
Union Chargeability, Comm. [180] 357

Denman, Hon. G., *Tiverton*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 564, 572
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Comm. [179] 56
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 193
Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 576, 579
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 909; Res. 1101
Merchant Shipping Disputes, Leave, [178] 268; 2R. [180] 599
Militia—The 3rd Middlesex, [178] 1598
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 538
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1847
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 566
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 616

Dent, Mr. J. D., *Scarborough*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 5, [178] 1068

Derby, Earl of
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, Papers moved for, [179] 738
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 21, 31
Alkali Act—Inspector's Report, [179] 631
Army—Issue of Commissions, [180] 973
Augmentation Act, Returns, [177] 227
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1223
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180 693, 694
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 423, 425, 429, 438
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [180] 966
Cotton Manufacturing Districts, Distress in the —Mr. Farnall, [177] 582
Courts of Justice Building, 3R. *cl.* 16, [178] 1579, 1580
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *add. cl.* [178] 1586, 1587
Divine Worship in the Church of England, 2R. [180] 919
Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 192
Edmunds, Leonard—Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1210, 1212, 1215, 1219, 1220; Report of Select Comm. [178] 1525; Res. [179] 24, 26
[*cont.*

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
Marriages (Lambourne), Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 192
Oxford University (Vinerian Foundation), 2R. [179] 383
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Report, [180] 516, 518
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 630, 652, 656, 668
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [178] 1231, 1235
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. Amendt. [180] 772
St. Titus Church, Liverpool, [179] 860
Standing Order No. 191 — Displacement of London Poor, [178] 874
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [179] 4
United States—Assassination of President Lincoln, [178] 1074; Address moved, 1223; Explanation, 1452; — Belligerent Rights, [180] 1, 6

Dering, Sir E. C., *Kent, E.*
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1692
Forms of the House, [180] 410
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1064; *cl.* 4, 1067; *cl.* 5, 1068
Navy—Sheerness Dockyard, [180] 469
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 302

Devizes Turnpike Trusts
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 19, [179] 562

Devon, Earl of
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 645, 647
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 764

Dickson, Colonel J. A., *Limerick Co.*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 651, 655; Address moved, 904
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1796;—Pay and Allowances, 1973;—Clothing Establishments, 1974; — Disembodied Militia, 1976, 1978;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 247, 254;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, Adj. moved, 264, 265
Azeem Jah — Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1714
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 265
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 21, [179] 716
Game (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [177] 1528; Comm. [179] 372
Ireland — Railway System, Address moved, [178] 923
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 610
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 363; *cl.* 6, 366
Railway communication between Passengers and Guards, [177] 1742
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 59
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 618
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 464
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [178] 267

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 384, 396, 1204
Forms of the House, [180] 410
Irish Church, [179] 194
Isle of Man Disafforestation (Compensation), 3R. [178] 1520
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Railways (Guards and Passengers Communication), Res. [179] 70
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 410
Supply — Royal Parks, [179] 243; — New Houses of Parliament, 251, 252;—Patent Office, 255, 256;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 259;—Woods, Forests, &c. 706; — Department of Science and Art, 1163, 1165; Amendt. 1179; Report, 1260

Disraeli, Right Hon. B., *Buckinghamshire*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 154
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1446 1448, 1449, 1691
Canada — Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1570
Cobden, Mr., The late, [178] 676
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 778; Res. [180] 1134
Poor Law Board and the High Wycombe Union, Papers moved for, [179] 216, 230
Princess of Wales—Address of Congratulation, [179] 1270
Private Business of the Session, [180] 1164
Roman Catholic Oath, [179] 743; Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 52
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 172
United States—Assassination of President Lincoln, Address moved, [178] 1245

District Church Tithes Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Marlborough*)
l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 24 (No. 45)
Read 2ª after short debate *April* 27, [178] 1074
Committee*; Report *May* 8 (No. 93)
Committee* *May* 11; Report* *May* 12
Read 3ª* *May* 16 (No. 101)
c. Read 1°* *May* 29 [Bill 186]
Read 2°* *June* 1
Committee*; Report *June* 2
Read 3°* *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 42]

Divine Worship in the Church of England Bill (*The Marquess of Westmeath*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *June* 26, [180] 762 (No. 218)
Moved, "That the Order of the day for second reading be read and discharged" (*The Marquess of Westmeath*); Motion agreed to; after short debate, Bill withdrawn *June* 29, 918

Divisions in the House of Lords, Manner of Taking
Standing Order proposed (*The Duke of Richmond*); after short debate, postponed *May* 29, [179] 957; [180] 347; (*Chairman of Committees*) 853—(see *Parliament*)

Dockrall, Mr., Detention of
Moved for Copies of Correspondence relating to (*The Earl of Malmesbury*) *Mar* 24, [178] 188; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Dockyard Extensions Bill
(*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
179] *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 12 [Bill 145]
. Read 2° after debate *May* 18, 540
. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 26, 948
. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the expense of the Contracts for Dockyard Extensions to be authorised by this Bill would best be defrayed by Terminable Annuities, as in the case of the Fortifications under the Act 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 80" (*Sir James Elphinstone*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, agreed to; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee, and reported, 948
Read 3° * *June* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Somerset*) *June* 2
Read 2ª * *June* 15 (No. 143)
Committee *; Report *June* 16
Read 3ª * *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 51]

Dockyard Extensions
Observations, Sir Morton Peto; Reply, Lord Clarence Paget; debate thereon *May* 29, [179] 1036

Dockyard Ports Regulation Bill
(*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Read 1ª * *June* 16 (No. 167)
Read 2ª * *June* 20
Considered in Committee * *June* 22 (No. 246)
Read 3ª * *June* 23
c. Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 244]
Read 2° * *June* 26
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3° * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 6 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 61]

DODSON, Mr. J. G. (Chairman of Committees), *Sussex, E.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1793;—Manufacturing Departments, 1990;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 175
Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. [179] 826
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 491
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 739, 740, 741, 742
County Voters Registration, Leave, [177] 1364
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 871
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 480, 482
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1201, 1202
Inclosure, Comm. [178] 628
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 314
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 538
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [179] 1263
Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. [179] 705, 709;—Department of Science and Art, 1164;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1285, 1286, 1287
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Leave, [178] 49; 2R. [180] 215, 231
[*cont.*

DODSON, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [180] 688
Union Chargeability, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 521
Westminster Improvement Commission, [180] 44

Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Luke White*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 127]
Read 2° * *May* 12
179] Considered in Committee *May* 17, 480; after debate, Committee—R.P.
. Committee; Report *May* 22, 716
. Considered as amended *May* 25, 859
Read 3° * *May* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *May* 29 (No. 129)
. Read 2ª after short debate *May* 30, 1044
Committee *; Report *June* 2
Read 3ª * *June* 16
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 50]

DONOUGHMORE, Earl of
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [177] 1221; Comm. 1645; Report, [178] 274; Commons Amendts. 1307
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 554, 555
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 43
Fisheries Commissioners, Chairman of the, [180] 350
India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 261, 277, 285
Ireland—(John Darcy and Robert Davidson), Papers moved for, [177] 131;—Arming the Constabulary, 230
Irvin, Mr. D'Arcy, Papers moved for, [177] 231
Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1596
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. [180] 523
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [179] 719
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 923
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 113; *cl.* 5, 114
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1457
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees, 2R. [179] 630
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. Amendt. [179] 3

DOUGLAS, Sir C., *Banbury*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 661
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. Amendt. [179] 89
Convictions under Refreshment Houses Act, [177] 450, 749
Patent Office Accounts, [179] 637
Paymaster General and the Audit Office, [180] 627
Penalties Law Amendment, 3R. [180] 428

DOULTON, Mr. F., *Lambeth*
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 502, 508, 515
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 835
Middlesex Industrial Schools, Report, Amendt. [179] 975
New Museum of Natural History, [179] 876, 877
Supply—Office of Works, &c. [179] 945, 946

Drainage and Improvement of Landed Property (Scotland)
Observations, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Reply, Sir George Grey *June* 1, [179] 1124

Drainage and Improvement of Lands Acts (Ireland) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 3 [Bill 125]
Read 2°* *May* 15
Committee*; Report *May* 18
Read 3°* *May* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *May* 22
Read 2ª* *June* 15 (No. 117)
Committee*; Report *June* 16
Read 3ª* *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 52]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Peel, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20 [Bill 82]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 23, [178] 181; after short debate, A. 123, N. 72; M. 51; Read 2°
Committee*; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3°* *Mar* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 30 (No. 50)
Read 2 *; Committee negatived *April* 3
Read 3ª* *April* 4 *V*
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 c. 13]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Peel, Mr. Luke White*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 22 [Bill 163]
Read 2°* *May* 29
Committee*; Report *June* 1
Read 3°* *June* 8 [Bill 191]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 12
Read 2ª* *June* 15 (No. 147)
Committee*; Report *June* 16
Read 3ª* *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 53]

Drake, Mr., Case of the Late
Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 30, [178] 487

DRAX, Mr. J. S., *Wareham*
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 775

DUBLIN, Archbishop of
Church in Ireland—The 29th Canon of 1603, [180] 1160
Clerical Subscription, Comm. Amendt. [179] 959, 973

Dublin International Exhibition (1865) Bill (*Sir R. Peel, Mr. M. Gibson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 17]
Read 2°* *Feb* 17
Committee*; Report *Feb* 20
Read 3°* *Feb* 21
[*cont.*

Dublin International Exhibition (1865) *Bill*—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Feb* 23 (No. 13)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Mar* 23
Read 3ª* *Mar* 24
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [28 *Vict.* c. 6]

DU CANE, Mr. C., *Essex, N.*
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1139
Malt, Res. [177] 1257

DUFF, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Cape of Good Hope—Long *v.* Bishop of Cape Town, [179] 486
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 449
Colonial Bishops—See of Rupert's Land, [179] 1100
Government of India Act, [179] 582
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 171
India—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 412
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 207
University of London, [177] 1478; [179] 1209
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1337

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Piers and Harbours (Scotland), [179] 915, 920

DUFFERIN, Lord (Under Secretary for India)
East India (Governor General's Powers), Comm. [178] 870, 872
India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 264; [180] 1160
India—Titles to Land, [180] 1038

DUNCOMBE, Vice-Adm. Hon. A., *Yorkshire, E. R.*
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 603

DUNCOMBE, Hon. W. E., *Yorkshire, N. R.*
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 783

DUNKELLIN, Lord, *Galway Bo.*
India—The Bhootan Expedition, [178] 781
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 757;—Military Occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1569
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 65
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 570

DUNLOP, Mr. A. M., *Greenock*
Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1704
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1218
Episcopal Church in the Colonies, [178] 275, 276, 277
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1194
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 789
Law of Evidence, 2R. [177] 942
Writs Registration (Scotland), Leave, [177] 633; 2R. [178] 1160, 1571; Comm. Amendt. [179] 1188
Writs Registration, &c. (Scotland), Leave, [177] 951, 955

Dunne, Colonel F. P., *Queen's Co.*
Army—Rating of Houses of Officers, [179] 591
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1798;—Pay and Allowances, Adj. moved, 1822, 1960, 1967, 1969;—Disembodied Militia, 1978, 1980;—Volunteers, 1983;—Enrolled Pensioners, 1984;—Manufacturing Departments, 1998;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 246;—Military Education, 256;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 264, 852, 853;—Superannuation Allowances, Adj. moved, 858;—Administration of the Army, 986, 995
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 788
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 265
Drainage, &c. of Lands (Ireland), 2R. [178] 181
Holyhead Harbour, [178] 944
India—Delhi Prize Money, [179] 193
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 212
Ireland—Publication of Irish Records, [177] 288;—State of, Res. 690;—Military Occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1568
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [178] 753, 755
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 364
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 324
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 182
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 624
Records, Irish, Publication of, Res. [180] 457
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 468
Supply—Royal Parks, [179] 244, 246, 247;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 257, 259;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 600;—Rates for Government Property, 601;—Privy Council Office, 607, 609
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R. [178] 757; Comm. 1523
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908

Dunne, Mr. M., *Queen's Co.*
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 610

Dunsany, Lord
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Report, [178] 274

Dutton, Hon. R. H., *Hampshire, S.*
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1498

Dwellings for the Working Classes
Question, Mr. Augustus Smith; Answer, Mr. Tite *Mar* 10, [177] 1525

Dyce Sombre Case, The
Observations, Mr. Hennessy; Reply, The Attorney General *June* 30, [180] 1016

East India (Governor General's Powers, &c.) Bill (*Sir C. Wood, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 76]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Committee; Report *Mar* 28, [178] 456
Read 3° * *Mar* 31

East India (Governor General's Powers, &c.) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *April* 3 (No. 57)
Read 2ª * *April* 6
Committee; Report *April* 7, [178] 870
Read 3ª * *April* 27
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 17]

East India High Courts Bill (*Sir Charles Wood, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 77]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Committee *; Report *Mar* 28
Read 3° * *Mar* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Dufferin*) *Mar* 31 (No. 54)
Read 2ª * *April* 3
Committee *; Report *April* 4 (No. 62)
Read 3ª * *April* 6
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 15]

Ebury, Lord
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [180] 343
Burial Service, The, [180] 707; Res. 1026, 1032
Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 959
Museums, &c. Public, [180] 969, 971
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 2R. [178] 1235

Ecclesiastical Commission (Superannuation Allowances) Bill (*Mr. Walpole, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 201]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Read 3° * *June* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Chichester*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 22 (No. 189)
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 68]

Ecclesiastical Commission, The
Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 3, [180] 1044

Ecclesiastical Leasing Act (1858) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Walpole, Mr. P. P. Bouverie*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 140]
Read 2° *May* 12, [179] 260
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Chichester*) *May* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 125)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 57]

Edmunds, Leonard, Esq.—Resignation of Certain Offices
Lords—
On Motion of *The Lord Chancellor*, after debate, Select Committee appointed "to inquire into all the Circumstances connected with the Resignation by Mr. Edmunds of the

[*cont.*

Edmunds, Leonard, Esq.—Lords—cont.
Offices of Clerk of the Patents and Clerk to the Commissioners of Patents, and with his Resignation of the Office of Reading Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees in this House; and also into all the Circumstances connected with the Grant of a Retiring Pension to him by this House" *Mar* 7, [177] 1221
And, on March 9, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. President, D. Somerset, E. Derby, E. Graham, E. Clarendon, E. Malmesbury, V. Hutchinson, L. Panmure, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Chelmsford, L. Taunton
Letters and Documents respecting, referred to the Select Committee *Mar* 10
Ordered, That the Witnesses before the said Committee be examined on Oath; and that the Evidence taken from time to time before the said Committee be printed for the Use of the Members of this House, but no Copies thereof to be delivered, except to the Members of the Committee, until further Order *Mar* 14
Report of Committee—(*Parl. P.* L. No. 30)
Report of the Select Committee, Observations, The Earl of Derby *May* 5, [178] 1525; Notice of Resolutions, Lord Redesdale *May* 8, 1573
Resignation of certain Offices, and on the Pension granted to him by the House, Report of Select Committee read *May* 9, [179] 6
Resolutions moved thereon (*The Lord Redesdale*); after long debate, and a Question being stated thereupon, the previous Question was put? It was resolved in the Negative
Petition of Leonard Edmunds, Esq., Presented by Lord Wynford *May* 9, [179] 39; Read and Ordered to lie on the Table
Moved, "To rescind the Resolution of the House of the 24th February agreeing to the Report of the Committee on the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod made on the 17th February, so far as relates to the Recommendation of the said Committee that a retiring Provision of £800 per annum should be allowed to Leonard Edmunds, Esquire" (*The Lord President*) *May* 9, [179] 40; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Patent Office Accounts, Audit of the, Question, The Earl of Wicklow; Answer, Earl Granville *May* 15, [179] 260
Patent Office The, Appointment of Mr. Edmunds, Explanation, Lord St. Leonards *May* 23, [179] 717

Commons—
Edmunds, Leonard, Esq., Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 20, [177] 1921
Patent Office, Alleged Irregularities in the, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 6, [177] 1120—*Mr. Edmunds,* Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 20 [177] 1921
Patent Office—The Hon. Richard Bethell, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 16 [179] 392
Lords' Report—(*Parl. P.* c. No. 294)
Patent Office Accounts, Audit of the, Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 22, 637

Education
Committee of Council on Education, Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Constitution of the Committee of Council on Education, and the system under which the business of the office is conducted" (*Sir John Pakington*) *Feb* 28, [177] 847
Amendt. to add "And also into the best mode of extending the benefits of Government Inspection and the Parliamentary Grant to Schools at present unassisted by the State" (*Mr. Walter*); after long debate, Question, "That those words be there added" agreed to; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Select Committee appointed, 926
And, on March 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir John Pakington (Chairman), Mr. Bruce, Mr. Walpole, Viscount Enfield, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Clay, Mr. Howes, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Walter, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Buxton, and Mr. Liddell
Report of the Committee *June* 19—(*Parl. P.* No. 403)
Endowed Grammar Schools, Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 19, [180] 440
Endowments for—Minute of Council, Question, Mr. Adderley; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 2, 1317; Minute presented (*Mr. H. A. Bruce*) *May* 5, [178] 1535
Revised Code of Regulations, presented, Earl Granville *Feb* 17, [177] 316; presented by Command, Mr. H. A. Bruce; debate thereon *Feb* 17, 323—*Examination of Children under Six Years,* Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, Earl Granville *Mar* 16, 1732; Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, Earl Granville *April* 7, [178] 878
School Grants, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *May* 4, [178] 1465
Parl. Papers—
Revised Code, 1865 . . . . . . [3443]
Small Rural Schools . . . . . . [3444]
Endowments for Education . . . [3493]
Report of Committee of Council . [3533]

Educational and Charitable Institutions Bill (*Mr. Lygon, Mr. Walter*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 31 [Bill 97]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Lygon*) *June* 2, [180] 608
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Remington Mills*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.," 611; after short debate, A. 49, N. 35; M. 14; main Question agreed to
Read 2°; and committed for this day three months

Edwards, Lieut.-Colonel H., *Beverley*
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1261; 3R. [179] 804, 805
County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 100
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 864; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 545, 546, 550; *add. cl.* 554
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1343

Egerton Lord
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1035

Egerton, Hon. A. F., *Lancashire, S.*
Gunpowder, Accidents from, [179] 877
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 355
Volunteer Officers—Service on Juries, [178] 671

Egerton, Hon. W., *Cheshire, N.*
Union Chargeability, [178] 561

Egerton, Mr. E. C., *Macclesfield*
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1656
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 902 ; Res. 1129
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 122

Egypt—The Suez Canal
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 3, [177] 1044

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [177] 1978 ;—Yeomanry, 1982 ; — Manufacturing Departments, 1993, 1997, 2000
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. Previous Question moved, [178] 1392
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1605 ; [178] 242 ; Papers moved for, 793, 815, 816, 842, 848, 892
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 477
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 738
Jones, Mr. Mason, Explanation, [178] 1602
Lanarkshire County Prison Board, 2R. [178] 195
Roads (Scotland), [177] 1922
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [179] 303 ; Comm. Adj. moved, [180] 534
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 412, 413
Supply, Report, Res. 1, [178] 359, 362;—Office of Woods, &c. [180] 482 ;—National Gallery Enlargement, 489, 495, 497
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 779

Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment Bill (*Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Adair*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 19]
Read 2° * *Feb* 20
Considered in Committee after short debate ; Report *Feb* 23, [177] 632
Read 3° * *Feb* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 2
Read 2ª * *Mar* 13 (No. 21)
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 14
Report * *Mar* 23 (No. 35)
Read 3ª * *Mar* 24
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 8]

Elections, General Committee of
On Feb 9, Select Committee appointed as follows :—Rt. Hon. Sir Francis Thornhill Baring (Chairman), Rt. Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole, Rt. Hon. Lord Athlumney, Sir William Miles, Mr. George Ward Hunt, Mr. John Bonham-Carter

Ellenborough, Earl of
Army—Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, [177] 1112, 1113
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 433
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [179] 1046
Courts of Justice Building, Comm. [178] 1309 ; *cl.* 4, 1313 ; *cl.* 7, 1314
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 555
East India (Governor General's Powers), Comm. [178] 872
Patent Rights, [177] 636
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 919
Public Schools, [178] 746 ; Select Comm. 1304, 1305; Nomination of Comm. 1458, 1459
Standing Order No. 191—Displacement of London Poor, [178] 875
Tyne Improvement, 3R. [180] 848, 850

Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H., *Portsmouth*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [177] 91
Dockyard Extensions, 2R. Amendt. [179] 540 ; Comm. Amendt. 948, 949, 1037
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1018
India—Moorings at Calcutta, [177] 207 ;—The Budget, [178] 892 ;—Transport of Troops to, [179] 116 ;—Medal for, 563
Mauritius—Military Defence, [177] 1747
Navy—Armour-plated Ships in the Channel Fleet, [177] 140 ;—Repairs of the "Royal Sovereign," &c. 501 ;—Wages in Dockyards, 1143 ;—Board of Admiralty, [178] 700 ;—Widows of Warrant Officers, Res. [179] 579
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1187, 1192, 1403, 1453 ; Adj. moved, 1456 ;—Admiralty Office, [178] 727 ;—Coast Guard Service, 729 ; — Naval Establishments at Home, Adj. moved, 732, 733 ; — Wages to Artificers at Home, 948, 953 ;—Wages to Artificers Abroad, Adj. moved, 954 ;—Miscellaneous Services, 955 ;—New Works, &c. [179] 929, 940
Patent Office, Alleged irregularities in the, [177] 1122 ; —Accounts, [179] 638
Piers and Harbours (Scotland), [179] 918
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 258, 259 ;—Rates for Government Property, 602, 603

Emneth, Infant Mortality at, in Norfolk
Question, Mr. Brady ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 31, [178] 562

Enfield, Viscount (Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners) *Middlesex*
Infectious Patients in Workhouses, [177] 1534
Main Drainage (Metropolis), [177] 205
Poor Law—The Highworth Union, [180] 824
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [179] 492 ; *add. cl.* 519

Ennis, Mr. J., *Athlone*
Ireland — Railway System, Address moved, [178] 915

Enniskillen, Earl of
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [179] 4

Episcopate, Increase of the
Petition presented by Lord Lyttelton *June* 23, [180] 696; after debate, Petition read and ordered to lie on the table

Epping Forest, Alleged Murder in
Observations, Sir George Grey *May* 23, [179] 740

ESMONDE, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 990; *cl.* 9, 994
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 323; 2R. 509; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 591
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 437; Comm. 619
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 760

ESSEX, Earl of
Metropolitan Sewage—Report of Select Committee, [177] 640; Explanation, 735

Established Church Service—The Rev. A. D. Wagner
Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report to this House as to the mode in which the service of the Established Church is administered at the church of St. Paul's, Brighton," &c. (*Mr. Whalley*) *May* 23, [179] 767; after debate, Question put, and negatived
See *Established Church—Confession in the*

EVERSLEY, Viscount
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 21

EWART, Mr. J. C., *Liverpool*
Army—Mackay's Gun, [180] 983
Isle of Man Disafforestation (Compensation), 3R. [178] 1520
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 554
Silver Coinage, [180] 261
South American Beef, [177] 1661

EWART, Mr. W., *Dumfries, &c.*
Army—Cultivation of Gardens by Soldiers, [178] 670
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 960
Foreign Office—Audit, [179] 1100
Grand Junction Canal Basin, [180] 1043
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1200
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 215, 223
United States—War in the, [178] 83

EWING, Mr. H. E. CRUM.- *Paisley*
Sugar Duties and Drawbacks, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 283
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 471, 473
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1203

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the, *see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER

Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000) Bill
c. Read 1° * *May* 11 [Bill 142]
Read 2° * *May* 15
Committee *; Report *May* 17
Read 3° * *May* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 19
Read 2ª * *May* 22
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *May* 26 [28 *Vict.* c. 29]

Excise Acts
Considered in Committee * *June* 20, [180]
Resolution reported * *June* 21

Executions at Newgate
Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 4, [178] 1465

Exeter, The Diocese of
Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 7, [178] 931

Exhibition of Miniatures at Kensington
Question, Earl Stanhope; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 16, [180] 332

Expiring Laws
Select Committee appointed and nominated June 13 as follows:—Mr. Peel (Chairman), Mr. Dodson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Cowper, Sir William Jolliffe, Colonel French, Mr. Baring, Mr. Brand, Mr. Dunlop, and Lord John Manners
Report *June* 20—(*Parl. P.* No. 391)

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 235]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Considered as amended * *June* 26
Read 3° * *June* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 27
Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 226)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 119]

Factories Act—The Clay Yards
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 4, [178] 1467

Falmouth Borough Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Mr. St. Aubyn*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 200]
Read 2° * *June* 16
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Cranworth*) *June* 22
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 201)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 103]

Farquhar, Sir W. M. T., *Hertford*
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1602
Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. [180] 301
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 681
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [180] 529; *cl.* 11, 531, 532
Government Annuities, [180] 823
India—War in Bhootan, [179] 1120;—Mortality in the Royal Artillery on the March from Mhow to Kirkee, 1120;—Lucknow Prize Money, [180] 730
New Zealand, [177] 1745
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 727
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [179] 1328, 1329
Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1144;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1284
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1889
Wellington, Duke of, Monument at St. Paul's, [178] 80

Fellowes, Mr. E., *Huntingdonshire*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [178] 1063, 1064; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1060; *cl.* 5, 1068

Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice Bill
(*Mr. Denman, Mr. Locke, Sir C. O'Loghlen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 21]
Read 2° after short debate *Feb* 22, [177] 576
Committee *; Report *Feb* 24
Considered * *Feb* 27
Read 3° * *Mar* 1
l. Read 1 * (*Lord Chelmsford*) *Mar* 2 (No. 22)
Read 2ª after debate *Mar* 16, 1725
Committee *; Report *Mar* 23
Read 3ª * *Mar* 24
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 18]

Fenwick, Mr. H., *Sunderland*
County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 12, [179] 101
Malt for Cattle, [177] 321
Sheep and Cattle, 2R. [178] 469

Fergusson, Sir J., *Ayrshire*
Army — Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 531;—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 649
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Comm. [179] 58; Report, 1238, 1244
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1585
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1198
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 213
Ireland—Administration of Justice, [177] 1826
Law of Evidence, 2R. [177] 945
Marriage Certificates, Stamp Duties on, [179] 298
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. Amendt. [177] 589, 596
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, Amendt. [178] 1504
Writs Registration (Scotland), 2R. [178] 1167, 1571; Comm. [179] 1194, 1198

Fermoy, Lord, *Marylebone*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 74
Bank Notes (Ireland), 2R. [180] 607
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [180] 531; Consid. *cl.* 18, 719
Metropolitan Paving, &c. Commission moved for, [180] 138
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. Amendt. [180] 719
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 617
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1252
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 518

Ferrand, Mr. W. B., *Devonport*
Charities, The vacant Inspectorship of, [180] 263
Navy—Wages in Dockyards, [177] 1136;—Devonport Dockyard — Payment for Extra Time, 1738;—Widows of Warrant Officers, Res. [179] 582
Parochial Medical Relief, [178] 568
Registrarship of the Court of Bankruptcy, Leeds, [179] 293, 489; Comm. moved for, 775, 778
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1344
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 356, 1204; Comm. [179] 136, 142, 172
Waterworks and Reservoirs, [177] 600, 1042; [178] 7
Wycombe Poor Law Union, [178] 82

Financial Statement
Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, [177] 1534; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, [178] 1466

Finlay, Mr. A. S., *Argyllshire*
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 397
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 866
Supply—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, [179] 597, 598;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1309
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1197

Fire Brigade (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered * *May* 17
Read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 153]
Read 2° after debate *May* 25, [179] 828
Committee * *June* 19—r.p.
Committee; Report *June* 20, [180] 529
Considered as amended *June* 23, 718
Read 3° * *June* 23 [Bill 230]
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 215)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 90]

Fire Insurance Duty
Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, [178] 1467
Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the reduction of Fire Insurance Duty, made in the last Session, be

[*cont.*

Fire Insurance Duty—cont.
extended, at the earliest opportunity, to houses, household goods, and all descriptions of insurable property" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *Mar* 21, [178] 35; after debate, previous Question put, A. 137, N. 65; M. 72; main Question agreed to, 37; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 44

Fires at Theatres and Places of Public Amusement
Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 10, [177] 136;—*in London*, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *Mar* 21, [178] 7

Fires in London
Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *Mar* 21, [178] 7

Fisheries' Commissioners, The Chairman of the—(Mr. Eden)
Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 16, [180] 349

FITZGERALD, Mr. W. R. S., *Horsham*
Army Estimates, [177] 2000
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1539, 1562
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1897

FLOYER, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 317; Consid. [179] 681, 683

FORDE, Lieut.-Col. W. B., *Downshire*
Ireland—County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, Adj. moved, [178] 199

Foreign Jurisdiction Act Amendment Bill
(*Earl Russell*)
l. Read 1ª * *June* 23 (No. 211)
Read 2ª * *June* 26
Committee *; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
c. Read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 251]
Read 2 * *June* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3 * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 116]

Foreign Law, Convention respecting
Question, Mr. J. J. Powell; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 3, [180] 1044

Foreign Office—Audit
Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 30, [179] 1100

Foreign Statistics
Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 2, [177] 958

Foreign Wines
Question, Sir FitzRoy Kelly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 11, [179] 113

Forfeiture for Treason and Felony Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered * *May* 5
Read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 134]

Forfeitures on Conviction of Felony
Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 13, [177] 205

FORSTER, Mr. C., *Walsall*
Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic, [177] 1663;—Forged Signatures, Report, 1735; Res. [178] 1604, 1607; Comm. [179] 53; Report, 1230, 1241, 1246, 1247;—Discharge of Marshall and Whitehead, 1267
Forfeiture for Treason and Felony, [180] 445
Forfeitures on Conviction of Felony, [177] 205
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 647
Parliament, Prorogation of the, [180] 914
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, Amendt. [177] 99;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 444

FORSTER, Mr. W. E., *Bradford*
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [178] 991
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1398, 1445, 1640
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1555, 1557
Companies Workmens' Education, [180] 446
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 482
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 920
Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. [180] 613
Flogging in Gaols, [178] 79
Government Annuities Act, [177] 238
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1938
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 585, 626
Mines, Comm. moved for, [179] 73
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1509, 1510
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1348
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 224, 228, 237
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1850
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 147, 307
United States—The "Alabama," [179] 1108
Zollverein, The, [178] 1535

FORTESCUE, Earl
Cotton Manufacturing Districts, Distress in the—Mr. Farnall, [177] 580
Poor Relief (Metropolis) Act (1864), Return moved for, [177] 202

FORTESCUE, Right Hon. C. S. (Under Secretary for the Colonies), *Louth Co.*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 143
British Kaffraria, Comm. [177] 1094; *cl.* 14, 1098
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1590; Papers moved for, [178] 839
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1517, 1519

[*cont.*

Fortescue, Right Hon. C. S.—*cont.*
- New Zealand — Military Contriution, [177] 1748
- Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 438, 443, 446
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 238

Fortifications and Works Bill
- *c.* Considered in Committee *June* 13
- Resolutions [June 13] reported *; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 215]
- Read 2° * *June* 16
- Committee *; Report *June* 19
- Read 3° * *June* 20
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 20 (No. 180)
- Read 2ª * *June* 22
- Committee *; Report *June* 23
- Read 3ª * *June* 26
- Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 61]

France
- *Commercial Treaty with*, Question, Mr. Treherne; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 16, [177] 1748
- *Importation of Salt into*, Question, Mr. J. Tollemache; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 15, [179] 292

Fraser, Sir W. A., *Ludlow*
- Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Discharge of Marshall and Whitehead, [179] 1267
- Bath, Order of the, Address moved, [180] 403
- Metropolitan Paving, &c. Commission moved for, [180] 132, 139
- St. James' Park, [179] 1347
- Supply—New Houses of Parliament, [179] 250, 252;—Nelson Column, 255;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 256, 258;—Public Offices Site, 259;—Woods, Forests, &c. 704;—Inspection, &c. of Prisons, 1152;—National Gallery, 1275;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1286, 1290;—Special Missions, 1295;—Superannuation Allowances, 1297;—Miscellaneous Expenses, 1312

French, Colonel F., *Roscommon Co.*
- Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 786
- Colonial Defences, [179] 1107
- Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 1513; Comm. *cl.* 3, [179] 987; *add. cl.* 995
- Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 483
- Education — Endowments for, Minute of Council, [178] 1537
- Ireland—State of, Res. 673;—Military occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1570
- Records, Irish, [180] 368; Res. 459
- Shannon River, [177] 660; Nomination of Comm. [179] 555; Adj. moved, 556
- Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 602;—Woods, Forests, &c. 711;—Superintendent of Roads, South Wales, 1137;—Landed Estates Court, 1151
- Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R [178] 757
- Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 845

Fulmer Common, Inclosure of
- Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 6, [177] 1116

Gallwey, Sir W. P., *Thirsk*
- Great Western Railway, Accident on the, [179] 1337
- Railway communication between Passengers and Guards, [177] 1741, 1742
- Railways (Guards and Passengers Communication), Res. [179] 60, 71, 72
- Westminster Improvement Commission, Returns moved for, [179] 206

Galway, Viscount, *East Retford*
- Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. Amendt. [177] 1653
- Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 103; Comm. 720
- Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 615, 618
- South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 362
- Theatres, 2R. [180] 332

Game (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Hervey Bruce, Colonel Forde*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 24 [Bill 42]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 10, [177] 1528; A. 50, N. 8; M. 42; Read 2° *Mar* 10
- Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Sir Hervey Bruce*) *May* 15, [179] 372
- Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Commitee (*The O'Conor Don*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Game Licences (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Baring*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° after short debate *Feb* 13, [177] 224 [Bill 16]
- Read 2° * *Feb* 17
- Committee *; Report *Feb* 20
- Read 3° * *Feb* 21
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *Feb* 23
- Read 2ª * *Mar* 3 (No. 14)
- Committee *; Report *Mar* 7 (No. 23)
- Read 3ª * *Mar* 9
- Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [28 *Vict.* c. 2]

Gaols, Flogging in
- Questions, Mr. Scully, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 77

Gaughan, Catherine, Case of
- Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 4, [180] 1158

Gavin, Major G., *Limerick City*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [177] 90
- Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 63

General Post Office (Additional Site) Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Cowper*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 94]
Read 2° * *April* 7
Referred to Select Committee:—Mr. Cowper (Chairman), Mr. Adam, Mr. Dutton, Mr. Lygon, Mr. Peel, and Mr. Tomline *April* 26
Report * *May* 16 [Bill 149]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 26
Read 2ª after short debate *June* 2, [179] 1186
Report * *June* 20 (No. 124)
Committee * *June* 22; Report * *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 87]

George, Mr. J., *Wexford Co.*
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 521
Record of Title (Ireland), Comm. [179] 1182
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R. [178] 756
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1907

German Zollverein, The
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 19, [180] 446

Gibson, Rt. Hon. T. M. (President of the Board of Trade), *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Agricultural Statistics, [178] 560
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 787
British India and Colonial Trusts, &c. Corporation, [180] 926
Ceylon—Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks, [179] 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135
Chain Cables and Anchors, [179] 46; [180] 734
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88; Adj. moved, [180] 873
Foreign Statistics, [177] 958
France—Commercial Treaty with, [177] 1753
Great Western Railway, Accident on the, [179] 1337, 1345, 1347
Great Yarmouth Borough, Haven and Port, 2R. [177] 746
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 172, 176
Holyhead Harbour, [178] 945
Industrial Exhibitions—Protection of Inventions, [177] 320
Ireland—Dublin and Holyhead Steamers, [179] 293
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1659
Malt, Res. [177] 1283, 1293
Master Manufacturers—Rental on Machinery, [180] 540
Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 602
Oyster Fishery, [178] 672
Paper Trade, Res. [179] 757, 760; [180] 132
Parliamentary Counsel, Fees of, [177] 498
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1273, 1293; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 526, 527; *add. cl.* 531, 535, 539
Piers and Harbours, [179] 1122
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 569
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 108;—Printing Petitions, 114; Res. 285;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 443
[*cont.*

Gibson, Rt. hon. T. M.—*cont.*
Railway Accidents, [177] 116; Res. 1132; Papers moved for, [180] 1169
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 620, 621, 623
Railway communication between Passengers and Guards, [177] 1742
Railway Construction Facilities Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 594
Railway Travelling, [180] 262
Railways (Guards and Passengers communication), Res. [179] 66, 71, 72
Russia Company Dues, [177] 235
Salt, Importation of, into France, [179] 292
Scotland—Port Patrick Harbour, [178] 783
Sea Fisheries, [177] 748
Standing Orders Nos. 32 & 40, Amendt. [180] 1161
Supply—Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, [179] 595;—Lighthouses Abroad, 595, 596;—Board of Trade, 610, 611;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277, 1278, 1279
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 226
Thames Embankment, [180] 633
Thames, The, at Hampton Court, [178] 80
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1892
Trinity Board—Steam Tugs, [177] 1117
Waterworks Bills, [177] 1042
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1485
Wrecks and Casualties, Abstract of, [177] 288, 1663
Wrecks on the Coast of Devon and Cornwall, [177] 499
Zollverein, Treaty with the, [180] 465

Gilpin, Colonel R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1812;—Pay and Allowances, 1822;—Administration of the Army, [178] 993
Army—Number of the, [177] 746
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 848

Gilpin, Mr. C., *Northampton*
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 95
Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 465
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [179] 1302;—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 473
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 511, 513

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *see* Chancellor of the Exchequer

Goldsmid, Sir F. H., *Reading*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1656
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 742
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 307; 3R. 1026
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 932
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1107
Prisons, Leave, [177] 218
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 103;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 445
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1352
Schleswig-Holstein Duchies, [178] 929
Supply—Royal Parks, [179] 246

Gore, Mr. W. R. Ormsby, *Leitrim Co.*
- Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [179] 978, 983; *cl.* 3, 987
- Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 21, [179] 859
- Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1659

Goschen, Mr. G. J., *London*
- Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 630; Comm. [178] 1264; *cl.* 8, 1268; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 823
- Bankruptcy Act (1861), Res. [179] 1114
- Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. Adj. moved, [178] 455
- Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1217
- India—Expedition to Bhootan, [178] 939
- Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1295
- Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 550
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), Leave, [178] 48; 2R.* [180] 185, 231
- Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1887

Government Annuities Act
- Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, [177] 238; Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, 499; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 2, 957; Question, Mr. Salt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 2, 959; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 26, [180] 823

Gower, Hon. E. F. Leveson, *Bodmin*
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 596

Gower, Mr. G. W. G. Leveson, *Reigate*
- River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1343

Granard, Earl of
- Ireland—Poor Law Unions, [180] 431

Grand Junction Canal Basin, The
- Question, Mr. W. Ewart; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *July* 3, [180] 1043

Grand Juries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Mr. McMahon, Mr. Maguire*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 27 [Bill 93]
- Bill withdrawn* *June* 21

Granville, Earl (Lord President of the Council)
- Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, Papers moved for, [179] 738, 739
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 30, 31
- Agricultural Gangs, Address moved, [179] 177
- Army—Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, [177] 1113
- Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Commons Amendts. [178] 1306

[*cont.*

Granville, Earl—*cont.*
- Burial Service, Res. [180] 1031
- Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 1026
- Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 430
- Cartoons at Hampton Court Palace, [178] 558
- Casual Poor—Metropolis, [178] 5
- Church in Ireland—The 29th Canon of 1603, [180] 1160
- Clerical Subscription, 2R. [179] 872; Comm. 962; *cl.* 4, 974; Report, 1045, 1047, 1049
- Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1034
- Companies Workmens' Education, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [179] 955
- Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [179] 185
- Cotton Manufacturing Districts, Distress in the—Mr. Farnall, [177] 581, 582
- Courts of Justice Building, Comm. [178] 1309
- Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *add. cl.* [178] 1587
- Destitute Poor (Metropolis), Returns moved for, [177] 98
- Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 554
- Divine Worship in the Church of England, 2R. [180] 919
- Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 958
- Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 191
- Easter Holidays, Notice, [178] 486
- Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1218, 1219, 1220; Report of Select Comm. [178] 1525; — Pension, Res. [179] 15, 27, 40, 44
- Education—The Revised Code of Regulations, [177] 316;—National, 1734;—Examination of Children, [178] 878, 879
- Fisheries Commissioners, Chairman of the, [180] 349
- Illicit Distillation—The Constabulary, [177] 277;—In Clare and Donegal, Return moved for, 281
- Imperial Gas, 2R. [179] 865
- Imprisonment on Civil Process, Middlesex, [178] 3
- Ireland—John Darcy and Robert Davidson, Papers moved for, [177] 131;—Magistracy and Police Force, Papers moved for, 133;—Arming of the Constabulary, 229;—Public Records relating to, 742; — Catharine Gaughan, Papers moved for, [178] 272; [179] 723, 725, 1186; [180] 1159;—J. and C. Hannigan, Papers moved for, [179] 558; —Poor Law Unions, [180] 432
- Irvin, Mr. D'Arcy, Papers moved for, [177] 230
- Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1596
- Liverpool Borough Prison, [180] 859
- Locomotives on Roads, Nomination of Comm. [180] 9
- Lord Chancellor, Resignation of the, [180] 1142
- Metalliferous Mines, 2R. [179] 624
- Metropolitan Sewage—Report of Select Committee, [177] 641
- Mines, Report on, [179] 388
- Miniatures, Exhibition of, at South Kensington, [180] 333
- Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [179] 723
- Museums, &c. Public, [180] 970

[*cont.*

Granville, Earl—*cont.*
North West Territory—British North America, [177] 587
Parliament, Dissolution of the, [180] 850
Patent Office Accounts, Audit of the, [179] 261
Patent Rights, [177] 736
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 922
Penalties Law Amendment, 2R. [180] 969
Police (Ireland), Returns moved for, [178] 1598
Poor Rates, Metropolitan and Suburban Districts, [177] 280
Poor Relief (Metropolis) Act (1864), Return moved for, [177] 202
Princess of Wales, Address moved, [180] 109
Prisons, 2R. [180] 518; Comm. *cl.* 68, 854; Schedule 2, 855; Report, 921
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [179] 1117; Comm. [180] 112; *cl.* 5; Amendt. 114; Report, 516, 518
Public Schools, Select Comm. [178] 1304
Railway Passengers, [180] 432, 434, 436
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [177] 735
Roman Catholic Schools, [180] 859
Russia—Epidemic in, [178] 744, 880
Saffron Hill Murder—Case of Pelizzioni, [178] 485
Singapore and the Straits Settlements, [180] 438
Slave Trade Papers, [180] 334
Transportation to Australia, [177] 739
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 9
Winslow, Mr., Pension to, [180] 1142

Great Western Railway Accident
Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 9, [179] 1337

Great Yarmouth Borough, Haven and Port Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir H. Stracey*) *Feb* 27, [177] 744; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Warner*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after debate, A. 129, N. 17; M. 112; Read 2° *Feb* 27

Greaves, Mr. E., *Warwick*
Bank Notes Issue, 3R. [179] 806
Bristol and North Somerset Railway, 2R. Amendt. [178] 877

Green, Mary, Case of
Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 27, [178] 1082

Greenock Railway Bill
c. Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee" (*Mr. E. P. Bouverie*) *April* 28, [178] 1193; after debate, A. 110, N. 76; M. 34

Greenwich Hospital Bill
(*Mr. Childers, Lord C. Paget, Mr. Adam*)
178] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Childers*); after long debate, Bill ordered; read 1° *April* 25, 1002 [Bill 133]

Greenwich Hospital Bill—cont.
179] Read 2° after long debate *May* 29, 996
. Committee; Report *May* 29, 996 [Bill 179]
. Committee (*on re-comm.*); after short debate, Considered *June* 8, 1314
Committee—R.P.
180] Considered in Committee; Report *June* 13, 124
. Considered as amended *June* 19, 499
Read 3° * *June* 20 [Bill 212]
l. Read 1ª * (*Duke of Somerset*) *June* 20
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 27, 855; after short debate, Motion agreed to
. Read 2ª *June* 27 (No. 179)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 89]

Greenwich Union — Cases of Mary Moriarty, Julia Hannon, and Others
Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 23, [177] 596

Greenwood, Mr. J., *Ripon*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 4, [178] 1067; 3R. Amendt. [179] 372

Gregory, Mr. W. H., *Galway Co.*
Army—Military Store Department, [177] 1123
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. Adj. moved, [178] 1445, 1449, 1613
British Museum, Enlargement of the, [179] 391
Confederate States—British Property in the, [177] 1922
Game (Ireland), Comm. [179] 372
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 722
National Gallery—Mr. Frith's "Derby Day," [178] 1238
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1068
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1537, 1557, 1558
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [179] 1176;—British Museum, 1352;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 494

Gregson, Mr., late Chairman of the Public Petitions Committee
Observations, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 16, [177] 286

Grenfell, Mr. C. P., *Preston*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [177] 1979

Greville, Colonel F. S., *Longford Co.*
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 787
Ireland—Administration of Justice, [177] 1825; —County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 201
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 598
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 181
Railway Travelling, [180] 262
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 756

Grey, Earl
- Ashworth, Mr. C., Case of, [177] 119
- Burial Service, Res. [180] 1032
- Companies Workmens' Education, Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 956
- Imperial Gas, 2R. [179] 865
- Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257
- Marriages (Lambourne), Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 191
- Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 114
- Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 800
- Tyne Improvement, 3R. [180] 850
- Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 36

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Morpeth*
- Abingdon Gaol, [177] 116
- Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 660
- Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, [179] 1248;—Discharge of Marshall and Whitehead, 1268
- Ballot, The, [177] 660
- Belfast—Riots at, [177] 382, 389, 400; Res. [180] 163
- Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1446, 1469, 1471, 1629
- Bristol, Episcopal residence at, [180] 632
- Capital Punishment within Gaols, Leave, [177] 455
- Chemists and Druggists (No. 2), 2R. [178] 476
- Church Attendance on Sundays, Leave, [177] 948
- Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 396
- Church of England Usages, Comm. moved for, [179] 775
- Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 90
- Clerical Subscription, Leave, [178] 1710; 2R. [180] 634; Comm. *cl.* 1, 839; *cl.* 4, 841; Consid. 879
- Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 992; *cl.* 9, 993, 994
- Convictions under Refreshment Houses Act, [177] 452, 749
- Convocation—Alteration of the Canons, [179] 1269; [180] 369
- County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Consid. [180] 847
- County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 100, 101; *add. cl.* 102
- Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order No. 88, [180] 874; No. 90, 877
- Craythorne, Walter, Case of, [179] 1335
- Dogs, Ownerless, [180] 365
- Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1128
- Drake, Mr., Case of the late, [178] 488
- Ecclesiastical Commission, [180] 1044
- Education—Minute of Council, [178] 1318
- Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. [180] 614
- Established Church Service — Rev. A. D. Wagner, Comm. moved for, [179] 771
- Execution at Durham, [178] 8
- Executions at Newgate, [178] 1465
- Exeter, Diocese of, [178] 934
- Factories Act—The Clay Yards, [178] 1467
- Farm Buildings and Cottages (Scotland), [180] 982

[*cont.*

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
- Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 579
- Fires at Theatres, &c. [177] 136
- Flogging in Gaols, [178] 78, 79
- Gunpowder, Storage of, [177] 1116
- Herring Fishery (Scotland), [177] 846
- Highways Act, [178] 84
- Inclosure, Comm. [178] 628
- Industrial Schools, Suspension of Standing Order, [178] 486
- Infant Mortality at Emneth, [178] 562, 959
- Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 800;—Case of Mary Ryan, 1535;—County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 201;—Titles to Land, 888;—Opening of the Dublin Exhibition, 1604;—The Irish Church, [179] 194;—Roman Catholic University, [180] 1177
- Kent, Constance, Case of, [179] 48
- Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 779; Res. [180] 1134
- Licensing Laws, [177] 1116
- Liturgy, Revision of the, [179] 1122
- Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 647
- Lock Out in the Iron Trade, [178] 92
- Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 1060, 1070; *cl.* 2, 1065, 1066; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1067; *cl.* 5, 1069; *cl.* 8, 1070
- Marriage Law, [177] 447
- Mayne, Sir R., and the Barnet Magistrates, [178] 722
- Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 886
- Metropolitan Paving, &c. Commission moved for, [180] 139
- Metropolitan Police Rate, [177] 1904, 1905
- Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1055
- Middlesex Industrial Schools, Consid. [179] 1265
- Mines, Condition of, [178] 1599; Comm. moved for, [179] 72, 73
- Minor Canons, &c. [180] 989
- Monastic and Conventual Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1077, 1080
- Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [177] 270
- Murder in Epping Forest, [179] 740
- Patent Office—Mr. Edmunds, [177] 1921
- Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 511; Comm. *cl.* 4, 595
- Pollution of Rivers, [179] 1102
- Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 728
- Powder Magazines, Government, [177] 135
- Princess of Wales — Address moved, [179] 1270
- Prison Libraries, [177] 747
- Prisons, Leave, [177] 212; 2R. 1361, 1362; Comm. *cl.* 15, [179] 1328; *cl.* 19, 1329; *cl.* 21, 1330; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1330; *cl.* 42, 1331; *cl.* 53, 1331; Schedule 1, 1333, 1334, 1335
- Prisoners in Newgate, Treatment of, [177] 599, 1024, 1025, 1026
- Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 574
- Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 112
- Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment, Leave, [177] 254; [178] 489; 2R. 867; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 512, 543, 545, 548, 550; Amendt. 551, 552; *add. cl.* 553, 554
- Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1306, 1307
- Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 182

[*cont.*

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
Reformatory Children, Exhibition of, [178] 1001
River Waters Protection, Leave, [177] 127; 2R. 1331, 1333
Roman Catholic Oath, Leave, [178] 31; 2R. [179] 456, 461, 469; Comm. 613, 617, 741; *cl.* 1, [180] 64
Russia—Epidemic in, [178] 784, 889
Saffron Hill Murder, [177] 209; [178] 84
St. James' Park, [179] 1348
Sewage Utilization, Leave, [177] 127; 2R. 1360
Smith or Swanson, Margaret, Case of, [178] 84
South American Beef, [177] 1661
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 257, 258;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 598;—Rates for Government Property, 604;—Woods, Forests, &c. 705, 706, 711;—Office of Works, &c. 943;—Lunacy Commissions, 1137;—Secret Service, 1139;—Inspection, &c. of Prisons, 1153; Report, 1260;—Bermudas, 1289;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1287;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1299
Theatres, &c. 2R. [180] 182
Titles to Land Registration (Ireland), [177] 747
Turnpike Tolls Abolition, Leave, [178] 1524; 2R. [180] 593
Turnpike Trusts, [177] 138
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 171, 172, 173
United States—Assassination of President Lincoln, [178] 1081; Address moved, 1242
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 549
Upper Street, Islington, Disgraceful State of, [179] 239, 241
Wakefield Gaol, [177] 1091
Waterworks and Reservoirs, [177] 601; [178] 7
Wednesday Sittings—Suspension of Standing Order, [180] 1163

Griffith, Mr. C. Darby, *Devizes*
Abingdon Gaol, [177] 116
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 641, 660, 662, 744; Address moved, 880, 888, 892, 898; Explanation, 1041, 1336;—Dress of Military Chaplains, [180] 731
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 663; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 839
Courts of Conciliation, [178] 489
Devizes Turnpike Trust, [179] 562
Egypt—The Suez Canal, [177] 1044, 1759
Financial Statement, [178] 1466
Ireland—Administration of the Law, [177] 1740, 1829
Italy—Capture of British Subjects by Brigands, [180] 1162
Juries in Criminal Cases, 2R. [177] 1724
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [178] 753
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [178] 1065; *cl.* 1, 1071
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 276
Parliamentary Counsel, Fees of, [177] 498
Pensions to Officers of the House of Lords, [177] 1370
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1849
Postmaster General, Office of, Comm. moved for, [178] 378, 895
[*cont.*

Griffith, Mr. C. Darby—*cont.*
Post Office—Threepenny Postage Stamp, [177] 409
Prisons, Leave, [177] 222, 223; 2R. 1361, 1362
Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1167, 1169
Railway Travelling, [180] 263
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 617
Secretary of State for War, Res. [180] 450, 457
Secret Service Money, Returns moved for, [180] 590, 592
Simony, Law of, [180] 982
Supply—New Houses of Parliament, [179] 251;—Foreign Office, 606;—Secret Service, 1138, 1139;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1279;—Royal Academy of Music, 1280;—Labuan, 1281;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1285, 1287
"Times," The, and the Budget, [179] 299
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. Adj. moved, [180] 687, 688; Schedule, Amendt. 846
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, [178] 1015
United States—Proclamation of President Johnson, [179] 563

Grogan, Sir E., *Dublin City*
British North America—Red River Territory, [179] 976
Ireland—Royal Hibernian Military School, Returns moved for, [178] 542;—Deep Sea Fishery, 669
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 267

Grosvenor, Earl, *Chester*
Union Chargeability, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 520

Hadfield, Mr. G., *Sheffield*
Bank Notes Issue, 3R. [179] 803, 804; Re-Comm. Amendt. 810
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1394
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 90, 96
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 654; Comm. 838
Clonpriest, &c. Benefices (Ireland), Returns moved for, [177] 249
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 828
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 178; 2R. 292
Crown Suits, &c. [179] 490
Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. [180] 611, 613
Flogging in Gaols, [178] 78, 79
Indemnity, Leave, [180] 624; 2R. Amendt. 684
Inland Revenue, Comm. Preamble, [180] 308
Ireland—Administration of Justice, [177] 1829
Law of Evidence, &c. Leave, [177] 261
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 783
Local Government Supplemental, Comm. [178] 1034, 1035
Obsolete Acts of Parliament, [178] 1002
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 574
Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment, Leave, [177] 256
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 2R. [177] 210; 3R. [178] 181
[*cont.*

HADFIELD, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Supply—Rates for Government Property, Adj. moved, [179] 604
United States—Consuls for the Southern States, [180] 367

HALIBURTON, Mr. T. C., *Launceston*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 133
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 793

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord C., *Tyrone Co.*
Belfast—Riots at, [177] 366, 371
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 3, [180] 105
India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 862
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1302, 1307
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 183

HAMILTON, Major W. F., *Linlithgowshire*
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 66

Hampton Court Palace, Cartoons and Ornamental Screens at
Observations, Lord St. Leonards *Mar* 31, [178] 556; Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 15, [179] 301—*Parl. P.* (L.) No. 84

HANBURY, Mr. R., *Middlesex*
Executions at Newgate, [178] 1465
Nazareth—Church at, [178] 79
Newington Green and Hornsey Road, [178] 1239
Night Refuges (Metropolis), [177] 1920

HANKEY, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 625; Comm. [178] 1260; *cl.* 8, 1266; Amendt. 1268; *add. cl.* 1272
Charitable Trusts Fees, 2R. [178] 1027
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 735
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 840
Fires in London, [178] 7
Metropolitan Paving, &c. Commission moved for, [180] 137
Minor Canons, &c. [180] 987
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 221
Supply — Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 258;—Board of Trade, 610;—Royal Academy of Music, 1280

Harbours of Refuge
Breakwater at Alderney, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 19, [179] 560
Moved, "That Her Majesty's Ministers should now adopt measures for the construction of some of the Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Great Britain and Ireland, recommended by a Committee of this House in 1858, and by a Royal Commission in 1859" (*Sir Frederick Smith*) *June* 13, [180] 164; after long debate, A. 99, N. 111; M. 12

Harbours of Refuge—cont.
Harwich Harbour, l. Considered in Committee* *June* 29; Reported* *June* 30
Holyhead Harbour, Question, Colonel Dunne; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 7, [178] 944

Harbours Transfer Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Lord C. Paget*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 14 [Bill 216]
Read 2°* *June* 16
Committee*; Report *June* 19
Read 3°* *June* 20 [Bill 250]
l. Read 1ª* (*Duke of Somerset*) *June* 20
Read 2ª* *June* 22 (No. 182)
Committee* *June* 23; Report* *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 100]

HARDCASTLE, Mr. J. A., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Malt, Res. [177] 1272; Previous Question moved, 1298
Prison Libraries, [177] 747

HARDWICKE, Earl of
Army—Issue of Commissions, [180] 973
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [180] 964
Courts of Justice Building, Comm. [178] 1309
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 20
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [180] 856
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 867, 872; Comm. [180] 256, 257
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 3R. [179] 1115
Navy—Masters in the, [179] 384;—Captains on the Reserved List, [180] 979;—Warrant Officers, 980

HARDY, Mr. G., *Leominster*
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 402
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 875
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 911
Law of Evidence, 2R. [177] 943; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [180] 311, 314
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 899
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 656
Prisons, Leave, [177] 223
Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 444
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 229

HARDY, Mr. J., *Dartmouth*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1064

HARROWBY, Earl of
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 439
Casual Poor—Metropolis, [178] 6
Courts of Justice, The New, Returns moved for, [177] 1916
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 37
Education, National, [177] 1732, 1735
Education — Revised Code — Examination of Children, [178] 878, 879
Episcopate, Increase in the, [180] 705
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 798, 800

Hartington, Marquess of (Under Secretary for War), *Lancashire, N.*

Armstrong Guns for Foreign Governments' [177] 960

Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1761, 1815, 1820;—Pay and Allowances, 1821, 1822, 1964, 1967, 1973;—Clothing Establishments, 1974;—Divine Service, 1974;—Martial Law, 1975;—Disembodied Militia, 1976, 1980;—Yeomanry, 1981, 1983;—Volunteers, 1983;—Enrolled Pensioners, 1984, 1985;—Manufacturing Departments, 1986, 1990, 1994, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 94, 249, 253;—Military Education, 258, 262;—Miscellaneous Services, 263;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 264, 853, 856;—Superannuation Allowances, 858;—Administration of the Army, 976, 994

Army—Regimental Quartermasters, [177] 115;—Armstrong and Whitworth Guns, 320, 1739; [179] 48; [180] 366;—Armstrong 12-pounder Guns, [177] 449, 450;—Recruiting, Commission moved for, 526; [178] 372; [180] 539; Number of the, 747;—Military Reserve Fund, 1043;—The Ordnance Survey, 1092;—Military Store Department, 1123;—Irish or Roman Catholic Recruits, 1740; [179] 639;—The War Office, [177] 1830; [178] 202;—Rifle Brigade and Whitworth Rifles, [177] 1921;—Libraries, &c. Papers moved for, [178] 47;—The Foot Guards, 89;—Depôt Battalions, Explanation, 241;—Ordnance Select Committee, 371; [179] 1226, 1229;—Cultivation of Gardens by Soldiers, [178] 670;—Ordnance Experiments, 672;—Conversion of Enfield Rifles, [179] 389;—Military Telegraphs, 491;—Contagious Diseases Prevention Act, 562;—Military Reserve Fund, 639;—Military Train, 641;—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, 647, 662; Address moved, 887, 888, 892, 1336, 1337;—Regimental Paymasters, [180] 366; Armstrong Gun Commission, 368;—Employment of Dr. Sutherland, 441, 442, 991;—Dress of Military Chaplains, 731;—Mackay's Gun, 983;—Field Allowance to Officers at Aldershot, 984

Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 846, 848

China—Indian Allowance in, [178] 82

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 837

Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1935

Ireland—Royal Hibernian Military School, Returns moved for, [178] 542

Indian Staff Appointments, [177] 1043

Militia—Travelling Allowances, [177] 846;—The 3rd Middlesex, [178] 1599;—Reviews of the, [180] 538

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 363, 364; *cl.* 26, 368; *cl.* 31, 369

Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 982

New Zealand—Prize Money, [178] 81;—Troops in, 83;—Military Chaplains in, [179] 1230

Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the, [179] 213

Secretary of State for War, Res. [180] 457

Supply, Report, Res. 1, [178] 359

Tower, Deputy Lieutenancy of the, [177] 1044

United States—War in the, [178] 83

[*cont.*

Hartington, Marquess of—*cont.*

Volunteer Rifles, Promotion in, [177] 1662; [179] 47;—Allowances to Sergeant Instructors, [178] 86, 671;—Volunteer Officers—Service on Juries, *ib*

Harwich Harbour Bill

(*Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)

c. Considered in Committee; Bill ordered * *May* 4

Read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 137]

Read 2° * *May* 29

Referred to Select Committee * *June* 1

Report * *June* 14 [Bill 214]

Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 20

Read 3° * *June* 21

l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 22

Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 197)

Referred to Select Committee *June* 29

Report of Select Committee * *June* 30

Committee * *July* 3; Report * *July* 4

Read 3ª * *July* 4 (No. 234)

Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 120]

Hassard, Mr. M. D. *Waterford City*

Greenwich Hospital Comm. *cl.* 5, [179] 1318; *cl.* 10, 1321

Ireland—Grand Juries, [177] 207

Record of Title (Ireland), Comm. [179] 1182; *cl.* 10, [180] 87

Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 46

Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908

Hay, Sir J. C. D., *Wakefield*

Africa, Western—Rumoured Expedition against Ashantee, [177] 323

Army—Armstrong and Whitworth Guns, [177] 320;—Armstrong Gun Commission, [180] 368

Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 801

Dockyard Extensions, 2R. [179] 541

Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1012; Comm. *cl.* 5, [179] 1315, 1318; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1322, 1323, 1325

Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 177

Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1065; *cl.* 5, 1068

Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 979, 985

Navy—Captain Sayers' Life Boat, [177] 659;—Chaplain General, 1010;—Widows of Warrant Officers, Res. [179] 577, 581

Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1392, 1404, 1408, 1414, 1416, 1455;—Coast Guard Service, [178] 727;—Wages to Artificers at Home, Adj. moved, 733;—Miscellaneous Services, 954;—Naval Stores, 995;—Half Pay, 996

Supply, Report, Res. 1, [178] 359, 1038

Headlam, Right Hon. T. E. (Judge Advocate General), *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*

Army—Sentences of Courts Martial, [177] 1043;—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 651; Address moved, 904

Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 602

Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 884

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [178] 366

Heathcote, Sir W., *Oxford University*
- Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 662
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 223

Henley, Lord, *Northampton*
- Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [180] 844
- Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 312; Comm. [179] 333

Henley, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
- Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 821, 822
- Chain Cables and Anchors, [180] 737
- Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 494
- Civil Service Estimates, [178] 741
- Colonial Docks Loans, 2R. [180] 595
- Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 514
- Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 990
- Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. [180] 301
- County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges Salaries), Res. [180] 528, 529; Consid. 847
- County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 12, [179] 101; *add. cl.* 103
- Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 870
- Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 936
- Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 482
- Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1129
- Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 916
- Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1202
- Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 1320; *add. cl.* [180] 129, 130, 131
- Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. [178] 751
- Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 314
- Leeds Bankruptcy Court, Res. [180] 1130
- Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [178] 1062; *cl.* 2, 1065; *cl.* 4, 1067, 1068; *cl.* 6, 1069
- Malt, Res. [177] 1292, 1293
- Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 276
- Mayne, Sir R., and the Barnet Magistrates, [178] 724
- Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 603
- Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 885
- Metropolitan Houseless Poor, Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [178] 761, 764
- Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [177] 271
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 364
- Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 221
- Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1299; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 527; *cl.* 2, 531
- Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 324; 2R. 510, 511
- Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 92, 103; Comm. 723, 729
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 15, [179] 1329; *cl.* 22, 1330; *cl.* 53, 1331; Schedule 1, 1333
- Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 111
- Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 866; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 546, 548, 551
- Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1172

[*cont.*

Henley, Right Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
- Railway Bills (Group 8), Res. [179] 875
- Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 623
- River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1356
- Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 76
- Savings Banks and the National Debt, [180] 442, 444
- Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 468
- Supply — Works and Public Buildings, [179] 704;—Woods, Forests, &c. 709, 710; [180] 484; — Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, [179] 1279; — Consular Establishments Abroad, 1292;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 498
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 242
- Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 228
- Union Chargeability, Leave, [177] 482; 2R. [178] 343; Comm. [179] 171; Adj. moved, 173, 303, 307, 364, 371; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 492, 510, 511; *add. cl.* 525; Consid. 669, 671, 673, 689; *add. cl.* 700, 701; 3R. 789
- Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1020
- University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 586
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1482, 1483, 1492, 1493

Hennessy, Mr. J. P., *King's Co.*
- Amberley, Viscount, Travelling Expenses, [179] 1294, 1296; [180] 449
- Army Estimates— Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, [178] 264
- Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1702;—Forged Signatures, Report, 1737; Res. [178] 1606, 1612; Comm. [179] 54, 60; Report, 1230, 1232, 1237, 1243, 1246, 1247;—Discharge of Marshall and Whitehead, 1266, 1267
- Belfast—Riots at, [177] 407
- Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. [178] 1303
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [180] 671, 676; 3R. 828
- Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 928; Amendt. 938; Comm. Adj. moved, [178] 179
- Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1205, 1213
- Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 480; *cl.* 6, Adj. moved, 481
- Drainage of Lands, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [178] 181
- Dyce Sombre Case, [180] 1016
- Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 922
- Green, Mary, Case of, [178] 1082
- Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1010; Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1316, 1318
- Indemnity, 2R. [180] 685
- India — Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 412
- Inland Revenue, Comm. Res. 2, Amendt. [179] 713
- Ireland—Royal Dock in Cork Harbour, [177] 116;—State of, Res. 661, 677, 827, 828;—Case of Patrick Doyle, 1480; — Medical Officers in Unions, Res. 1518, 1521;—Administration of the Law, 1740, 1828;—County Down Assizes — Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 201;—Music at the Dublin Exhibition, 1470, 1471; Res. 1572;—The Constabulary, [179] 1341; — Roman Catholic University, [180] 1176

[*cont.*

HENNESSY, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 909, 910; Res. 1091, 1092, 1126
Lock Out in the Iron Trade, [178] 90
Middlesex Industrial Schools, Report, [179] 975; Consid. Amendt. 1263
Monastic and Conventional Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1064; Explanation, 1637
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 31, [178] 368
Paper Trade, Res. [179] 757
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, Adj. moved, [180] 107
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1831, 1850
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 99
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303, 1306
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 181
Supply, Report, Adj. moved, [178] 360;—Works and Public Buildings, [179] 703;—Woods, Forests, &c. 706;—Printing and Stationery, 1142, 1145;—Education (Ireland), 1254;—Special Missions (Viscount Amberley), 1294, 1296;—Superannuation Allowances, 1297;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1302;—Fishery Board (Scotland), 1305, 1308;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1309; Report, [180] 106
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [178] 955; [180] 730, 752
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 236, 237, 241
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), Comm. [178] 1521
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1907; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [178] 267
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 568

HENNIKER, Lord, *Suffolk, E.*
Union Chargeability, Consid. [179] 685

HERBERT, Hon. Colonel Percy E. *Shropshire, S.*
Army—Military Chaplains in New Zealand, [179] 1224;—Employment of Dr. Sutherland, [180] 442, 989

Herring Fisheries (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir W. Dunbar*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 2 [Bill 49]
Read 2° * *Mar* 9
Committee *; Report *Mar* 23
Considered * *Mar* 24
Read 3° * *Mar* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 28
Read 2ª * *May* 2 (No. 48)
Committee *; Report *May* 4
Read 3ª * *May* 5
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 22]

Herring Fishery (*Scotland*)
Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 28, [177] 846

HESKETH, Mr. T. G., *Preston*
Ceylon—Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks, [179] 1134

HEYGATE, Sir F. W., *Londonderry Co.*
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 455
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 481
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1129
India—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 413
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 696;—Dublin and Holyhead Steamers, [179] 292
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 615
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 457, 463, 468

HEYGATE, Mr. W. U., *Leicester*
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1260; *cl.* 8, 1266; *add. cl.* 1271; 3R. [179] 801; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, 819, 821; Amendt. 827
Bankruptcy Laws, [179] 49
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 93
Factories Act—The Clay Yards, [178] 1467
India—Staff Promotion in the Indian Army, [179] 297
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 779
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 536
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 614
Zollverein, Treaty with the, [180] 446

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
Capital Punishment within Gaols, Leave, [177] 455
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1519
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 857
County Voters Registration, Leave, [177] 1364
Patent Laws, [177] 1475
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 99
Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 459, 464
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1340
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 155; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 492

Highway Contracts, Stamp Duty on
Question, Mr. Trefusis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 19, [180] 446

Highways Act
Question, Mr. Richard Long; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 84

HODGKINSON, Mr. G., *Newark*
Endowed Grammar Schools, [180] 440
Government Life Annuity Bill, [177] 499
Patent Office—Mr. Edmunds, [177] 1921
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 308

HODGSON, Mr. R., *Tynemouth*
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 568
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 104;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 411
Railway Accidents, Res. [177] 1135

HOLLAND, Mr. E., *Evesham*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [178] 1063, 1065; *cl.* 6, Proviso, 1069; *add. cl.* 1071

Holyhead Harbour
Question, Colonel Dunne; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 7, [178] 944

Home-Grown Tobacco
Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, [180] 925

HORSFALL, Mr. T. B., *Liverpool*
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1212
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 645
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 528; *add. cl.* 532, 537, 554
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 618 622
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1858

HORSMAN, Right Hon. E., *Stroud*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1674, 1675
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 782
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1081, 1085; *cl.* 1, [180] 69, 70, 78

HOTHAM, Lord, *Yorkshire, E. R.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1808, 1820
Army—Military Reserve Fund, [177] 1043; [179] 639
Church Attendance on Sunday, Leave, [177] 947
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 869
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [178] 364
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 572

HOUGHTON, Lord
Abyssinia, Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [180] 1156
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 17
Belligerent Rights, [179] 286, 291
Casual Poor—Metropolis, [178] 3
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [180] 346, 347
Destitute Poor (Metropolis), Returns moved for, [177] 96
India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 280
Poor Relief (Metropolis) Act (1864), Return moved for, [177] 202
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 68, [180] 854
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [178] 75; Comm. Amendt. 273; Report, *add. cl.* 483; 3R. 768
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 660
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 2R. [178] 1228
Saffron Hill Murder—Case of Pelizzioni, [178] 484, 486

HOWARD, Right Hon. Lord E. G. F., *Arundel*
Middlesex Industrial Schools, Consid. [179] 1265
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 97; Comm. 726
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1096

HOWARD, Hon. C. W. G., *Cumberland, E.*
Greenwich Hospital, [179] 1009

HOWES, Mr. E., *Norfolk, E.*
County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [179] 102
Great Yarmouth Borough, Haven and Port, 2R. [177] 746
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, Res. [180] 1118, 1119
Police Superannuation, Comm. *add. cl.* [178] 1071, 1073

HUBBARD, Mr. J. G., *Buckingham*
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 622; Comm. [178] 1263; *cl.* 8, 1266, 1268; *add. cl.* 1272; 3R. [179] 807
Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 42
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1288; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 526, 527; *cl.* 2, 531
Union Chargeability, Comm, [179] 154; *add. cl.* 524, 525; Consid. 695
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, Amendt. [177] 1459; Adj. moved, [178] 1015
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Income, [178] 1501;—Fire Insurance, 1507
Zollverein, Treaty with the, [180] 461

HUMBERSTON, Mr. P. S., *Chester*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 571
Chain Cables and Anchors, [180] 736

HUNT, Mr. G. W., *Northamptonshire, N.*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 571
County Voters Registration, Leave, [177] 1363; Comm. Instruction, [179] 98; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 6, 99; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 10, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 12, 100, 102; *add. cl.* 102, 103
Juries in Criminal Cases, 2R. [177] 1724
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 317
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, Res. [180] 1045, 1117
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [178] 1065, 1066; *cl.* 4, Proviso, 1068; *cl.* 5, 1069
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 183
Prisons, Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1333
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 552
Roach River Fishery, 2R. Amendt. [179] 1262
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 613; *cl.* 1, [180] 49
Supply—Treasury, [179] 605;—Home Office, 606;—Privy Council Office, 609
Turnpike Trusts, [178] 1469
Union Chargeability, [178] 1204

Hutt, Case of Major General
Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Hutt *Mar* 13, [177] 1537

HUTT, Right Hon. W., (Paymaster of the Forces and Vice President of the Board of Trade), *Gateshead*
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 492
Hutt, Major General, Case of, [177] 1538
Malt for Cattle, [177] 321

Imperial Gas Bill
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Chairman of Committees*) *May* 26, [179] 862
Amendt. to leave out "now," and insert "this day six months" (*Lord Ravensworth*); after short debate, on Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" Cont. 43, Not-Cont. 46; M. 3; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 867; Bill to be read 2ª this day six months

Imperial Gas Company's Works at Chelsea
Observations, The Bishop of London; Reply, Lord Ravensworth *May* 11, [179] 108

Imprisonment of British Subjects in Abyssinia—see *Abyssinia*

Imprisonment on Civil Process, Middlesex
Question, The Marquess Townshend; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 21, [178] 2

Inclosure Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 89]
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Baring*) *Mar* 30, 540
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day week" (*Mr. Cox*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn
. Read 2° *Mar* 30, 540
. Committee; Report *Mar* 31, 627
Considered * *April* 3
Read 3° * *April* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 6
Read 2ª * *May* 2 (No. 64)
Committee *; Report *May* 4
Read 3ª * *May* 5
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 20]

Inclosure (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered* *May* 17
Read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 154]
Read 2° * *May* 25
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Read 3° * *May* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 30
Read 2ª * *June* 1 (No. 135)
Committee *; Report *June* 2
Read 3ª * *June* 12
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 39]

Income Tax Papers
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, [178] 670

Indemnity Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Presented; read 1° after short debate *June* 21, [180] 624 [Bill 234]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Peel*) *June* 22, 684
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Hadfield*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, A. 32, N. 18; M. 14; main Question agreed to; Read 2° *June* 22

Indemnity Bill—cont.
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 222)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 97]

INDIA
Army—
Army Promotion, Question, Mr. Cobbold; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 15, [180] 259
Bhootan, Affairs of, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 13, [177] 206 — *Expedition, to*, Question, Lord Dunkellin; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 6, [178] 781; Observations, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 7, 936; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 1, [179] 1120
Delhi Prize Money, Question, Colonel Dunne; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 12, [179] 193
Dhar Prize Money, Question, Mr. H. Lewis; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 19, [180] 442
Indian Army Commission, Question, The Earl of Longford; Answer, Lord Dufferin *July* 4, [180] 1159
Indian Medals, Question, Mr. W. Miller; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 15, [179] 302; Question, Mr. W. Miller; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 19, 563
Indian Officers, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to redress all such grievances complained of by the Officers of the late Indian Armies, as were admitted by the 'Commission on the Memorials of Indian Officers' to have arisen by a departure from the assurances given by Parliament, by 21 and 22 Vic. c. 106, and 23 and 24 Vic. c. 100" (*Captain Jervis*) *May* 2, [178] 1318; after long debate, A. 49, N. 36; M. 13; Her Majesty's Answer to Address [2nd May] reported *May* 9, [179] 45—*Grievances of*, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 29, [180] 926—*Officers of the late East India Company's Army*, Petitions, Observations, The Earl of Donoughmore; Answer, Lord Dufferin; debate thereon *May* 15, [179] 261
Indian Staff Appointments, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 3, [177] 1043; Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 15, [179] 297
Kirwee Prize Money, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 16, [177] 288
Lucknow Prize Money, Question, Mr. Scholefield; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 23, [178] 371; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 8, 1601; Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 23, [180] 730
Medical Officers, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 29, [180] 924
Mortality in the Royal Artillery on the March from Mhow to Kirkee, Question, Sir Minto Farquhar; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 1, [179] 1120

India—*Army cont.*

Native Artillery, Question, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 6, [177] 1118
Officers Serving in, Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 6, [178] 792
Pegu Prize Money, the, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 13, [177] 209; Question, Mr. H. Cole; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 6, [178] 783; Explanation, Sir Charles Wood *April* 24, 959
Satpoora and Goa Frontier Field Forces, Claims of the, Observations, Mr. Staniland; Reply, Mr. T. G. Baring *June* 23, [180] 748
Sixty-Fourth Foot, the, Question, General Buckley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 1, [178] 1240
Transport of Troops to, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 11, [179] 114

Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic—(see title *Azeem Jah*)
Bombay Back Bay Shares, Observations, Mr. Henry Seymour; Reply, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 20, [177] 1950
Buckle, Case of Mr., Question, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 19, [179] 561
Budget, The, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *April* 7, [178] 891; Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 1, [179] 1119; Questions, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Arthur Mills, and Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 15, [180] 260—(see *East India Revenue Accounts*)
Calcutta, Moorings at, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 13, [177] 207—*Sanitary State of*, Question, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 14, [177] 238
Ceylon, Lighthouse on the Basses Rocks, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 1, [179] 1130
Civil Service Examinations, Motion for an Address for "Copy of all Correspondence relative to the existing Regulations for the Examination of Candidates for the Civil Service in India, between the India Office and the Civil Service Commissioners, which has not yet been laid before Parliament" (*Mr. A. Mills*) *May* 16, [179] 394; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 15, 295
Disinfecting Powder for India, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 20, [177] 450
District Judges, Question, Sir Hugh Cairns; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 13, [177] 203
East India (Revenue Accounts), Considered in Committee *June* 29, [180] 927; Resolutions relating to the total net Revenues of the Territories and Departments, the several Presidencies, the North Western Provinces, and the Punjaub, &c. (*Sir Charles Wood*); Resolutions agreed to; To be reported Tomorrow; Resolutions [June 29] reported and agreed to *June* 30, [180] 1024
Export Duties, Question, Mr. Caird; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 3, [178] 1600
Finances, Question, Mr. Vansittart; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 23, [180] 731

{*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Godavery, Navigation of the, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 24, [177] 658
Government of India Act, Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Sir Charles Wood; debate thereon *May* 19, [179] 582
Irrigation Works, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 9, [179] 50
Labour Ordinance for, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir C. Wood *Mar* 24, [178] 236
Land Tenure in Oude, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 11, [179] 114; Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 19, [180] 447
Loan, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 8, [178] 1601
Madras Irrigation Company, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 23, [177] 593
Oude, Affairs of, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Mar* 17, [177] 1830; —*Talookdars and Cultivators of*, Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *Feb* 10, [177] 138
Singapore, Transfer of, Question, Mr. Mitchell; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *May* 16, [179] 389
Titles to Land in, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Lord Dufferin *July* 3, [180] 1038

India Office (Site and Approaches) Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Sir Charles Wood*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 56]
Read 2° * and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 20
And, on March 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cowper (Chairman), Lord John Manners, Sir John Shelley, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. H. B. Baring, Mr. E. P. Bouverie and Mr. Gaskell
Report of Select Committee * *April* 3 [Bill 100]
Committee; Report *April* 6, [178] 861
Considered * *April* 7
Read 3° * *April* 24
l. Read 1a * (*Lord Dufferin*) *April* 27
Read 2a * *May* 19 (No. 69)
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3a * *May* 26
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 32]

Industrial Exhibitions Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Milner Gibson*)

c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 36]
Read 2° * *Feb* 27
Committee *; Report *Mar* 3
Considered * *Mar* 6
Read 3° * *Mar* 7
l. Read 1a * (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 9 (No. 28)
Read 2a * *Mar* 16
Committee *; Report *Mar* 17
Read 3a * *Mar* 20
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [28 *Vict.* c. 2]

Industrial Exhibitions — Protection of Inventions
Question, Mr. Berkeley; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 17, [177] 320

Ingham, Mr. R., *South Shields*
Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1707
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1010; Comm. *cl.* 11, 1323

Inland Revenue Acts
Considered in Committee
Moved, "That it is expedient to make provision for allowing a Maltster the option of having the Excise Duty on Malt made by him charged according to the weight of the Grain used in the making of such Malt instead of by measure" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Motion agreed to *May* 18, [179] 555; Resolution reported; Bill ordered * *May* 19—(see title *Malt Duty Bill*)

Inland Revenue Bill
c. Acts considered in Committee
Resolutions (Stamp Duties—Fire Insurance) proposed by *The Chancellor of the Exchequer*, and, after debate, agreed to *May* 22, [179] 711; Resolutions reported; Bill ordered * *May* 25
Read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 169]
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 12
Committee; Report *June* 15, [180] 304
Considered as amended * *June* 20 [Bill 207]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 23
Considered as amended * *June* 26
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 105)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30 (No. 221)
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 96]

Inns of Court Bill
(*Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Hennessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° after short debate *Feb* 27, [177] 829 [Bill 44]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir George Bowyer*) *April* 26, [178] 1040
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Locke*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to
Read 2° *April* 26
Committee *; Report *May* 25 [Bill 164]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 1 [Bill 192]
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 20; [House counted out]

Insolvent Debtors Bill
(*Mr. Paull, Mr. Locke, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered * *Feb* 14
Read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 24]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 9

Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers
Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Layard; debate thereon *Mar* 24, [178] 202; Personal Explanations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane *Mar* 28, 372

Ireland
Barracks, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *Mar* 10, [177] 1461

Church
Church Establishment, Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the present position of the Irish Church Establishment is unsatisfactory, and call for the early attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *Mar* 28, [178] 384; after long debate, Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Goschen*); A. 221, N. 106; M. 115; Debate adjourned till Tuesday 2nd May; Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Mr. Dillwyn *April* 28, 1204; Question, Major Knox; Answer, Mr. Dillwyn *May* 12, [179] 194
Church in—The Twenty-Ninth Canon of 1603, Question, The Archbishop of Dublin; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 4, [180] 1160
Clonpriest, &c., Benefices—Church Patronage, Motion for Returns (*Mr. Scully*) *Feb* 14, [177] 239; after debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
Roman Catholic University, Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir George Grey *July* 5, [180] 1176

Cork Harbour, Royal Dock in, Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 9, [177] 116
Curragh of Kildare, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl De Grey and Ripon *April* 7, [178] 869—*Military Occupation of the*, Question, Lord Naas; Answer, Mr. Peel; debate thereon *May* 5, 1566
Deep Sea Fishery, Question, Sir Edward Grogan; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *April* 3, [178] 669
Dublin and Holyhead Steamers, Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *May* 15, [179] 292
Dublin Exhibition, The, Resolution (*Mr. Hennessy*); [House counted out] *May* 5, [178] 1572 — *Music at the*, Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 4, [178] 1470 — *Opening of the*, Observations, Sir George Grey *May* 8, [178] 1604
Duffy, Mr. Gavan, Dinner to, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *July* 3, [180] 1041

Education
School Reports, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 26, [179] 875
University Education, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system of University Education in Ireland prevent a large number of Her Majesty's Subjects from enjoying the advantages of University Education, and praying that such steps may be taken as will remove this grievance" (*The*

IRELAND—*Education*—cont.

O'Donoghue) *June* 20, [180] 541; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Fenian Brotherhood, The, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 7, [178] 890

Hannigan, John and Charles, Address for Papers (*Viscount Lifford*) *May* 19, [179] 556; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Land

Arterial Drainage, Question, Lord Naas; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 8, [177] 84

Drainage Act (1863), Question, Captain Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 2, [178] 1317

Law of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland—see that title

Tenure and Improvement of Land (*Ireland*) *Act*, Motion, "That the Select Committee on the Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act do consist of Seventeen Members;" debate adjourned *April* 7, [178] 955; Question agreed to *April* 27

Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Maguire (Chairman), Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Lord Naas, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Seymour FitzGerald, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Hunt, Mr. William Edward Forster, Lord Claud Hamilton, Colonel Greville, Sir Edward Grogan, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, The O'Donoghue, Lord Dunkellin, Mr. Caird, Mr. George, and Mr. Bagwell

Report brought up; after short debate, Report read; to lie upon the table and to be printed [No. 402] *June* 23, [180] 730; Observations, Mr. Hennessy; debate thereon *June* 23, 752

Law

Court of Admiralty, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 8, [177] 83

Court of Chancery (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 8, [179] 1269

Courts of Common Law, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 28, [177] 847

Grand Juries, Question, Mr. Hassard; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 13, [177] 207

Law Adviser to the Castle, The, Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *July* 3, [180] 1042

Titles to Land Registration, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 10, [177] 139; Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 27, 747; Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 7, [178] 888

Lottery Tickets, Circulation of, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 1, [179] 1121

Lunatic Asylums, District, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *June* 16, [180] 367

Lunatics in Gaols, &c., Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 19, [179] 591

Mail Service, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 13, [177] 204; Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 30, [179] 1099

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Patent and Close Rolls, Question, Mr. Longfield; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 17, [177] 1829

Police

Administration of Justice, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 16, [177] 1740; Question, Colonel Greville; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 17, 1825; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel Greville*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Belfast Commission of Inquiry, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 9, [177] 119—*Parl. P.* [3466]

Belfast, Riots at, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Hugh Cairns *Feb* 17, [177] 320; *The Royal Commission—Party Processions*, Question, Sir Hugh Cairns; Answer, Sir R. Peel; long debate thereon *Feb* 17, 328

Moved, That an inquiry be made in certain charges seriously impugning the official conduct of certain magistrates named therein, &c. (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *June* 13, [180] 140; A. 39, N. 132; M. 93—*Parl. P.* [3466]

Constabulary, Arming of the, Petition (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *Feb* 14, [177] 227—*Clothing*, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Feb* 13, [177] 206; Return ordered (*Colonel Dunne*) *May* 15, [179] 374; Observations, Mr. Blake; Reply, Sir Robert Peel *June* 9, 1338

County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 24, [178] 196; Debate arising, Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel Forde*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Darcy and Davidson, Motion for an Address for Papers connected with the Deaths of John Darcy and Robert Davidson (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *Feb* 10, [177] 128; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Doyle, Patrick, Case of, Observations, Mr. Hennessy *Mar* 10, [177] 1480

Game Licenses, Constabulary and the, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 20, [177] 1923

Gaughan, Case of Catherine, Observations, The Marquess of Westmeath *May* 23, [179] 723; Question, The Earl of Bandon; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 2, 1186; Motion for Address for Papers (*The Marquess of Westmeath*); after debate, Motion agreed to *Mar* 27, [178] 268; Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville *July* 4, [180] 1158

Illicit Distillation, The Constabulary, Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 10, [177] 277—*Clare and Donegal*, Address for a Return (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *Feb* 16, 280; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Irvin, Case of Mr. H. M. D'Arcy, Motion for Correspondence relating to the Case of Mr. H. M. D'Arcy Irvin, and the relation of the Police Force of Ireland to the County Magistracy (*The Earl of Leitrim*); after short debate, Motion postponed *Feb* 10, [177] 132; after debate, Motion amended, and agreed to *Feb* 14, 230

[*cont.*

Ireland—*Police*—cont.

Police in, Returns moved for (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *May* 8, [178] 1598 — *In Tipperary*, Question, Mr. Lanigan; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *May* 25, [179] 788

Stipendiary Magistrates, Mr. Ffrench, Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 10, [177] 1476

Poor Fishermen Act 5 *Geo.* IV. *c.* 64, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 26, [179] 914

Poor Law

Board, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Robert Peel *Mar* 14, [177] 1661

Donohue, Patrick, Case of, Motion for Papers (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *June* 19, [180] 467; debate thereon

Medical Officers in Unions, Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 17, [177] 319; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 10, To take into consideration the claims of Ireland to a grant of the half-cost of Medical Officers in Unions, with the view of providing for the same in future, as is now the practice in England and Scotland (*Mr. MacEvoy*), 1516; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, A. 37, N. 34; M. 3

Paupers, Removal of, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Villiers *Feb* 8, [177] 83

Unions, Petition presented by The Earl of Granard *June* 19, [180] 431; after short debate, Petition to lie on the table

Railway System, Question, Mr. Whiteside; Answer, Mr. Monsell *April* 3, [178] 675; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 7, To inquire into the Irish Railway System, with a view of ascertaining, with as little delay as possible, such facts as may enable this House to determine whether the provisions of the second clause of the General Railway Act of 1844 should be applied to such Irish Railways as are subject to its provisions (*Mr. Monsell*), 896; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, [180] 927

Railways—Liabilities of Shareholders, Observations, The Earl of Belmore *Feb* 9, [177] 95

Records, The Irish

Publication of, Question, Colonel Dunne; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 16, [177] 288; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 16, [180] 368; Moved, "That it is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken for their publication as has been for the publication of the Records of England and Scotland" (*Colonel Dunne*) *June* 19, 457

Brehon Laws, Question, Mr. McMahon; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 27, [177] 748

Carew and Carte Records, The, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Granville *Feb* 27, [177] 741

Royal Hibernian Military School, Motion for [*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Returns (*Mr. Maguire*) *Mar* 30, [178] 541; Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Whalley*); A. 10, N. 29; M. 19; original Question again proposed; [House counted out]

Ryan, Case of Mary, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 13, [177] 1535; Observations, The Marquess of Westmeath; Reply, Earl Russell *Mar* 14, 1646

Shannon, River, The, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 24, [177] 660 —(see title *Shannon River*)

Spirit Duties, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 28 (*Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*); [House counted out], [178] 1218

State of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "this House observes with regret the decline of the population of Ireland, and will readily support Her Majesty's Government in any well-devised measure to stimulate the profitable employment of the people" (*Mr. Hennessy*), [177] 661; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Maguire*); Motion negatived; after further debate, Debate adjourned; adjourned debate resumed *Feb* 27, 750; A. 107, N. 31; M. 76; Division List, 828

Taxation of, On Motion of *Colonel Dunne*, Select Committee re-appointed *Mar* 2, [177] 1027; Instruction, Sir Stafford Northcote

And, on Mar 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Dunne (Chairman), Sir Edward Grogan, Mr. Longfield, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Hennessy, Sir Frederick Heygate, Sir George Colthurst, Sir Robert Peel, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Howes, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Banks Stanhope; March 21, Lord John Browne added

Report of Select Committee *June* 1—(*Parl. P.* No. 330)

Iron Trade, The Lock-Out in the

Observations, Mr. Hennessy; Reply, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 90

Isle of Man Disafforestation (Compensation) Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Considered in Committee *Mar* 9, [177] 1457
Report*; Read 1°* *Mar* 10 [Bill 67]
Read 2°* *Mar* 27
Committee*; Report *May* 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Peel*) *May* 4, [178] 1520
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "said Order be Discharged" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*); Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question agreed to
Bill read 3° *May* 4

l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 5 (No. 91)
Read 2ª* *May* 12
Committee*; Report *May* 15
Read 3ª* *May* 16
Royal Assent *May* 26 [28 *Vict.* c. 28]

Italy—Capture of British Subjects by Brigands
Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr Layard *June* 20, [180] 539; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Layard *July* 4, 1162
Passports at Rome, Question, Mr. H. Baring; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 20, [177] 450

Jackson, Mr., Claims of
Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 30, [180] 974

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 506
Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 43
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1055, 1058
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 596
Railway Accidents, Res. [177] 1129
River Waters Protection, 2R. Amendt. [177] 1335
Westminster Improvement Commission, Returns moved for, [179] 210

JERVIS, Captain H. J. W., *Harwich*
Army Estimates—Enrolled Pensioners, [177] 1985;—Manufacturing Departments, 1990
Army—Military Telegraphs, [179] 491
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1944
Indian Officers, Address moved, [178] 1318, 1329
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1660
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 104

JERVOISE, Sir J. C. C., *Hampshire, S.*
Cattle Diseases Prevention, [179] 297
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 603;—Privy Council Office, 607
Treasure Trove, [180] 440

Johnson, Colonel, Case of
Observations, Earl Vane; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *May* 5, [178] 1531

JOHNSTONE, Sir J. V. B., *Scarborough*
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [179] 491; *add. cl.* 522, 525

JOHNSTONE, Mr. H. A. B., *Canterbury*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 115
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 223
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1848

JOLLIFFE, Right Hon. Sir W. G. H., *Petersfield*
Army—The Ordnance Survey, [177] 1091
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. [178] 1303
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1022; Comm. [180] 512
[*cont.*

JOLLIFFE, Right Hon. Sir W. G. H.—*cont.*
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. *cl.* 3, [178] 500
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 833
Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 25, [180] 305, 306
Middlesex Industrial Schools, Report, [179] 975
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 100
Prisons, Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1335
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1307
Supply—Privy Council Office, [179] 608;—Board of Trade, 609;—Office of Works, &c. 947
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 310; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 500

Jones, Mr. Mason
Explanation, Lord Elcho *May* 8, [178] 1602

Journals, Sub-Committee for the
Appointed *Feb* 7, [177]

Judgments (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Whiteside, Mr. George*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 68]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 1

Juries in Criminal Cases Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Longfield*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 26]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [177] 1717; after debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Juries Ireland Bill
(*The Marquess of Westmeath*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a} *April* 3, [178] 629 (No. 55)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}" *May* 8, 1595; after debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Justices of the Peace (Discretionary Powers) Bill
(*Sir Charles Douglas, Mr. Henry Fenwick*)
c. Read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 69]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 15

Justices of the Peace Procedure Bill
(*Mr. Paull, Mr. Staniland, Mr. R. Hodgson*)
c. Ordered * *Feb* 14
Read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 23]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 1

KEKEWICH, Mr. S. T., *Devonshire, S.*
New Zealand—Prize Money, [178] 81
Union Chargeability, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [179] 514, 518
Wrecks on the Coast of Devon and Cornwall, [177] 499

Kelly, Sir FitzRoy, *Suffolk, E.*
Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1664, 1699 ;—Signatures to Petitions, Report, Res. [178] 1609
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 470, 479
Chemists and Druggists (No. 2), Leave, [178] 46
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 4, [180] 666
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 856, 858
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 5, [179] 1318 ; *cl.* 10, 1319 ; Amendt. 1321 ; Consid. *cl.* 13, [180] 505
Law of Evidence, &c. Leave, [177] 257 ; 2R. 939, 945 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 308, 314 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 315, 317, 319
Malt, Res. [177] 1223
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 268
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1355
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 478
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1484
Wines, Foreign, [179] 113

Kendall, Mr. N., *Cornwall, E.*
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 176
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1335
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 345

Kennedy, Mr. T., *Louth Co.*
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 472 ; Comm. 615 ; *cl.* 1, [180] 74

Kent, Constance—Case of
Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 9, [179] 48
See also *Church of England—Confession in*

Ker, Mr. D. S., *Downpatrick*
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [178] 755
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 321
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1085

Killaloe, Bishop of
Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 964

King, Hon. P. J. L., *Surrey, E.*
Legacy and Succession Duty, [177] 134, 447
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 778

Kinglake, Mr. A. W., *Bridgwater*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 77
Army Estimates—Military Education, [178] 256
Canada — Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 820
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 476
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 91
Gunpowder, Storage of, [177] 1116
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 208

Kingscote, Colonel R. N. F., *Gloucestershire, W.*
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 495

Kingsdown, Lord
Juries (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1596
Union Chargeability, Comm. [180] 353

Kingstown Harbour Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee * ; Report ; Bill ordered * ; Read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 185]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee * ; Report *June* 15
Considered as amended * *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 22 (No. 188)
Committee * ; Report *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 67]

Kinnaird, Lord
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 870 ; Nomination of Comm. [180] 7, 9
Metalliferous Mines, 1R. [178] 479 ; 2R. [179] 621, 625, 626
Mines, Report on, [179] 387
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 112
Railway Passengers, 1R. [180] 108

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 661
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1098
British Guiana—Coolies, [179] 1103
China—Consular Courts in, [178] 81
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 292
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 926, 938
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1127
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 959
Farm Buildings and Cottages (Scotland), [180] 982
Government of India Act, [179] 585
Inclosure, 2R. [178] 541
India — Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 413
Mines, Condition of, [178] 1599
Navy Estimates—Miscellaneous Services, [178] 955
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1511
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 217
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 95
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 183
Roman Catholic Bishops, [180] 927
Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. [179] 708 ;—Secret Service, 1139 ; — Printing and Stationery, 1142 ;—National Gallery, 1272 ;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1284
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1020
United States—The Reciprocity Treaty, Papers moved for, [177] 414
Westminster Improvement Commission, Returns moved for, [179] 210

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*)
On Feb 8, Committee appointed as follows:—Colonel French (Chairman), Mr. Bentinck, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Dalglish, Colonel White, Mr. Onslow, and Mr. Alderman Rose

KNIGHT, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
- Agricultural Parishes, Returns moved for, [177] 830, 831, 1201, 1202
- Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 883
- Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [178] 537
- Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 96; Comm. 725
- Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 28, [180] 364
- Salmon Fishery Acts, [178] 889
- Union Chargeability, 2R. Adj. moved, [178] 355; Comm. [179] 120, 158; Consid. Amendt. 663, 696; *add. cl.* 700; 3R. 797

KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
- Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 4, [178] 1067
- Supply, Report, [178] 363
- Union Chargeability, 2R. Amendt. [178] 294; Comm. Adj. moved, [179] 170, 172; Comm. *cl.* 2, 513

KNOX, Hon. Major W. S., *Dungannon*
- Army—Field Allowance to Officers at Aldershot, [180] 984
- Belfast—Riots at, [177] 356, 357, 408
- Commissionaires, Band of the, [178] 1316
- Irish Church, [179] 194
- Supply — Superannuation Allowances, [179] 1298;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1299

KNOX, Colonel B. W., *Marlow*
- Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 650
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, Adj. moved, [178] 364
- Supply—Special Missions, [179] 1295;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1300
- Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 226
- Winslow's, Mr., Pension, [180] 1041

Lahore Bishopric Bill
(*Sir Charles Wood, Mr. Baring*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee * *Mar* 20
- Resolution reported *; Bill ordered *Mar* 21
- Read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 88]
- Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Charles Wood *June* 19, [180] 447
- Order for Second Reading of the Bill discharged; Bill withdrawn *June* 19

LAIRD, Mr. J., *Birkenhead*
- Armstrong Guns for Foreign Governments, [177] 960
- Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 845
- Chain Cables and Anchors, [179] 46; [180] 732
- Holyhead Harbour, [178] 945

[*cont.*

LAIRD, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1423;—Wages to Artificers at Home, [178] 947, 953;—New Works, &c. [179] 927, 938, 942, 943
- Navy—The "Royal Sovereign," [177] 961;—Portsmouth Dockyard, 1117; — Dockyard Expenditure, 1119; — Board of Admiralty, [178] 712;—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 399
- Supply, Report, [178] 1035, 1037, 1038

Lanarkshire County Prison Board Bill (*by Order*)
- *c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 24, [178] 194
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir E. Colebrooke*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate; A. 39, N. 95; M. 56; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; second reading put off for six months

Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway Bill (*by Order*)
- *c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 14, [177] 1653
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Viscount Galway*); Question, "That the words, &c.," 1654; after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 121, N. 162; M. 41; Bill put off for six months

Lancaster Court of Chancery Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cardwell*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 106]
- Read 2° * *April* 24
- Committee *; Report *April* 27
- Considered * *May* 1
- Read 3° * *May* 2
- *l.* Read 1a * (*The Earl of Clarendon*) *May* 4
- Read 2a * *June* 1 (No. 78)
- Committee *; Report *June* 2
- Read 3a * *June* 12
- Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 40]

Land Debentures Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Collins*)
- *c.* Ordered * *Feb* 13
- Read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 18]
- Read 2° * *Feb* 15; and committed to the Select Committee on Mortgage Debentures Bill—(see *Mortgage Debentures Bill*)
- Report * *Mar* 20 [Bill 79]
- Committee * *Mar* 28
- Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *April* 24
- Report * *April* 27
- Considered * *May* 1 [Bill 120]
- Read 3° * *May* 18
- *l.* Read 1a * (*Lord Cranworth*) *May* 19 (No. 112)
- Read 2a * *June* 15 and referred to a Select Committee (see *Mortgage Debentures Bill*, *June* 15)
- Report * *June* 19
- Committee * *June* 30

Land Debentures (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Scully, Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. P. Urquhart*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 9]
Read 2° * *Feb* 15; and committed to the Select Committee on Mortgage Debentures Bill—(see *Mortgage Debentures Bill*)
Report * *Mar* 20 [Bill 80]
178] Considered in Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *April* 5, 750
Committee *; Report *April* 7
Considered * (*on re-comm.*) *April* 27
As amended considered * *May* 1 [Bill 121]
Read 3° * *May* 18
Lords Amendments [Bill 249]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Cork*) *May* 19
Read 2ª * *June* 13 (No. 113)
Referred to a Select Committee * (see *Mortgage Debentures Bill, June* 15)
Report * *June* 19
180] Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House" (*The Earl of Cork*) 522; after short debate, Cont. 51, Not-Cont. 14; M. 37; resolved in the affirmative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 523
House in Committee; Amendts. made *June* 20
Considered in Committee *June* 20, 522 (No. 193)
Report * *June* 26 (No. 219)
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 101]

Land Debentures (Ireland) [Stamps]
Considered * *April* 6; Reported * *April* 7

Land Debentures [Stamps]
Considered * *April* 25; Reported * *April* 26

Land Drainage Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 110]
Read 2° * *April* 24
Committee *; Report *April* 26
Read 3° * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 28
Read 2ª * *May* 4 (No. 74)
Committee *; Report *May* 5
Read 3ª * *May* 8
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 23]

Lands and Heritages (Scotland) Valuation
Report of Select Committee *May* 22—(*Parl. P.* No. 300)

LANGTON, Mr. W. H. G., *Bristol*
Bristol and North Somerset Railway, 2R. [178] 887

LANIGAN, Mr. J., *Cashel*
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. Preamble, [179] 985; *add. cl.* 994, 996
Ireland—The Police in Tipperary, [179] 788
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 321; 2R. 509

Law Courts—see *Courts of Law*

Law of Evidence, &c. Bill
(*Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° after debate *Feb* 14, [177] 257 [Bill 20]
Read 2° after debate *Mar* 1, 939
Considered in Committee *June* 15, [180] 308
[No Report]

Law of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland
178] Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 31, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Laws regulating the relations between Landlord and Tenant in Ireland, with a view to their more equitable adjustment" (*Mr. Maguire*), 570; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Another Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Acts of 1860 upon the relations of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland" (*Viscount Palmerston*), 618; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Another Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Act 23 and 24 Vict. c. 153, on the Tenure and Improvement of Land in Ireland" (*Viscount Palmerston*); Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to
And, on April 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Maguire (Chairman), Mr. Secretary Cardwell, Lord Naas, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Hunt, Mr. William Edward Forster, Lord Claud Hamilton, Colonel Greville, Sir Edward Grogan, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, The O'Donoghue, Lord Dunkellin, Mr. Caird, Mr. George, and Mr. Bagwell
(*Parl. P.* No. 402)

LAWRENCE, Mr. Alderman J. C., *Lambeth*
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [179] 1171

LAWSON, Mr. W., *Carlisle*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry, Amendt. [177] 1981, 1983
Execution at Durham, [178] 7
Licensing Laws, [177] 1116
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. Amendt. [177] 642
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [178] 866, 868; Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 552
Saffron Hill Murder, [177] 209
Salmon Fishery Act Amendment, 3R. [180] 624
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1498

LAYARD, Mr. A. H. (Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs), *Southwark*
Abyssinia—British Prisoners in, [178] 958; [180] 999, 1002, 1013
Agency Money—Consul General at St. Petersburg, [177] 234
Anglo-Austrian Commercial Treaty, [180] 264

[*cont.*

LAYARD, Mr. A. H.—*cont.*
 Argentine Republic—Treatment of a British Officer, [180] 541
 Brazil and Uruguay, [177] 138, 658
 British Embassy at Washington, [177] 318
 British Passports to Rome, [177] 450
 China—British Subjects in the Chinese Service, [177] 287;—Consular Courts in, [178] 81;—Piracy in, 888;—Proceedings in, 1239;—Dismissal of Prince Kung, [179] 1209;—Foreign Vessels under the Chinese Flag, [180] 540
 Civil Service Estimates, [178] 739
 Confederate States Cruisers, [177] 1045;—Case of Captain Beale, 1536;—British Property in the, 1922
 Consular Reports, [178] 8
 Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, [177] 750; [178] 930
 Foreign Law, Convention of, [180] 1044
 Foreign Office—Audit, [179] 1100
 Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 206
 Ireland—The Fenian Brotherhood, [178] 891
 Italy—Capture of English Subjects by Brigands, [180] 539, 1162
 Morocco—The Jews in, [178] 1084
 Nazareth—Church at, [178] 79
 New Cross Roads, 2R. [177] 497
 Slave Trade, [177] 846
 State Papers, [178] 790
 Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1141, 1143;—Department of Science and Art, 1173, 1174, 1176;—Captured Negroes, &c. 1281;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1283, 1284, 1286, 1287, 1288, 1290, 1291, 1292;—Consular Establishments, China, Japan, &c. 1292;—Ministers at Foreign Courts, 1293;—Special Missions (*Viscount Amberley*), 1295, 1296; Report, Explanation, [180] 106, 449
 Taxes in Europe, [177] 958
 Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1873
 Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 689
 United States—The Reciprocity Treaty, Papers moved for, [177] 414;—Claims for Compensation, 1372, 1373;—The "Alabama," [179] 1108;—Case of the "Saxon"—Mrs. Gray, [180] 131;—Consuls for the Southern States, 368
 Zollverein, The, [178] 1535; [180] 446

LEATHAM, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
 Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1393, 1413
 Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 938

Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Registrarship of the

179] Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 15, 293
 Bethell, The Hon. Richard, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 16, [179] 392
. *Leeds Registrarship*, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 18, 489
. *Leeds Court of Bankruptcy and the Hon. R. Bethell*, Observations, Viscount Palmerston *May* 23, 744

[*cont.*

Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Registrarship of the—cont.

179] *Leeds Court of Bankruptcy*, Motion, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into all the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Henry Sedgwick Wilde as Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy at Leeds; the granting him a pension; the appointment of Mr. Welch to the said office; and whether he was to resign his appointment in favour of the Honourable Richard Bethell and receive another appointment in London" (*Mr. Ferrand*); after long debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed *May* 23, 775
180] And, on May 30, List of Committee reported from the General Committee of Elections as follows:—Mr. Howes (Chairman), Mr. E. C. Egerton, Mr. T. W. Evans, Colonel Pennant, Mr. H. H. Vivian, The Lord Advocate, and Mr. Bovill; Observations, Mr. Longfield; Reply, The Attorney General; long debate thereon *June* 27, 879
 Report *June* 22—(*Parl. P.* No. 397)
. Motion, "That a great facility exists for obtaining Public Appointments by corrupt means, &c." (*Mr. Hunt*) *July* 3, 1045
. Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "this House having considered the Report of the Select Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the evidence taken by it, agrees with the Committee in the opinion that the facts which are established acquit the Lord Chancellor from all charge in the matters to which it refers, except that of haste and want of caution in granting a pension to Mr. Wilde; but this House is of opinion that some further check should be placed by Law upon the grant of pensions to the holders of legal offices" (*The Lord Advocate*), 1072; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived; Question, "That those words be there added"
. Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Viscount Palmerston*); A. 163, N. 177; M. 14, 1134
. Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1136
 Question, "That those words be there added" (*The Lord Advocate*), put, and negatived
. Another Amendt. To add, after the first word "That," in the original Question, the words "This House, having considered the Report of the Committee on the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, and the Evidence taken before them, are of opinion, that, while the Evidence discloses the existence of corrupt practices, with reference to the appointment of Patrick Robert Welch to the office of Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, they are satisfied that no imputation can fairly be made against the Lord Chancellor, with regard to this appointment; and that such evidence, and also that taken before a Committee of the Lords to inquire into the circumstances connected with the resignation of Mr. Edmunds of the offices held by him, and laid before this House, show a laxity of practice and a want of caution with regard to the public interests, on the part of the Lord Chancellor, in sanctioning the grant of Retiring Pensions to Public Officers against whom grave charges were pending, which,

[*cont.*

Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Registrarship of the—cont.
180] in the opinion of this House, are calculated to discredit the administration of his great office" (*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie*), 1135
Question, "That those words be there added," agreed to; main Question, as amended, agreed to
Lord Chancellor, Resignation of the, Observations, Earl Granville *July* 4, 1142; Observations, Viscount Palmerston *July* 4, 1163; Personal Statement of The Lord Chancellor *July* 5, 1174

Lefevre, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [177] 1976;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 138
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 651
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 510
Confederate States Cruisers, [177] 1044
Fulmer Common, Inclosure of, [177] 1116
Liturgy, Revision of the, [179] 1122
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 230
United States—The "Alabama," [179] 1107

Lefroy, Mr. A., *Dublin University*
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 662
Clonpriest, &c. Benefices (Ireland), Returns moved for, [177] 247
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 791;—Railway System, Address moved, [178] 925
Navy—Naval Chaplains, [177] 1536
Railway Accidents, Res. [177] 1134
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 59
Railways (Guards and Passengers communication), Res. [179] 62, 65
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. Amendt. [179] 429, 433
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1253
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 589

Legacy and Succession Duty
Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 10, [177] 134; Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 20, 447

Leighton, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1065; *cl.* 5, 1069
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1059
Prisons, Leave, [177] 219; Comm. *cl.* 42, [179] 1331; Schedule 1, 1333
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 334; *cl.* 1, 491; *cl.* 5, 519; *add. cl.* 520, 522; Consid. 680, 692, 702

Leitrim, Earl of
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 33
Illicit Distillation—The Constabulary, [177] 277;—In Clare and Donegal, Return moved for, 280, 281
Ireland—John Darcy and Robert Davidson, Papers moved for, [177] 128;—Magistracy and Police Force, Papers moved for, 132, 133;—Arming of the Constabulary, 227;—Case of Catherine Gaughan, [179] 1186
[*cont.*

Leitrim, Earl of—*cont.*
Irvin, Mr. D'Arcy, Papers moved for, [177] 230
Police (Ireland), Returns moved for, [178] 1597
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [179] 4

Lennox, Lord H. G. C., *Chichester*
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 470, 471

Leslie, Hon. G. Waldegrave, *Hastings*
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1124
Ecclesiastical Leasing Act Amendment, 2R. [179] 260
Piers and Harbours, [179] 1121
Roman Catholic Oath, [179] 741

Leslie, Mr. W., *Aberdeenshire*
Cattle, Diseases in, [177] 1117
China—Taxation at Hong Kong, [177] 1119;—Indian Allowances in, [178] 81
Roads (Scotland), [177] 1922
Smith or Swanson, Margaret, Case of, [178] 84

Levi's, Dr. Leone, "Annals of British Legislation"
Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 16, [179] 392

Lewis, Mr. J. H., *Marylebone*
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries), Res. [180] 529
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [180] 530; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 533
Fires at Theatres, &c. [177] 136
India—Dhar Prize Money, [180] 442
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 886
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 593
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 720
Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 619
Regent's Park—Bridge over the Canal, [177] 600

Libel Bill
(*Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Longfield, Mr. Hennessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 21, [177] 561 [Bill 33]
Order for second reading read *May* 23; [House counted out]

Licensing Laws, The
Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 6, [177] 1116

Liddell, Hon. G. H., *Northumberland, S.*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [180] 1013
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1998
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1649
China—Foreign Vessels under the Chinese Flag, [180] 539
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 868
[*cont.*

LIDDELL, Hon. G. H.—*cont.*
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1011; 2R. [179] 1004; Comm. *cl.* 20, [180] 126; *cl.* 43, 127; *cl.* 51, Amendt. 129; *add. cl.* 130
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 176
India—Irrigation Works, [179] 50
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1058
Poor Law Unions—Auditors of Accounts, [178] 1203
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1350
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 335; *add. cl.* 521

LIFFORD, Viscount
Ireland—J. and C. Hannigan, Papers moved for, [179] 556;—Case of Catherine Gaughan, 725

LINCOLN, Bishop of
Agricultural Gangs, Address moved, [179] 177

Liverpool Borough Prison
Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 27, [180] 859

Liverpool Gunpowder Regulations, &c., Bill
c. Report * *May* 30

Liverpool Licensing Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 24, [177] 642
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the granting of Licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors is a subject which ought not at present to be dealt with by any Private Bill" (*Mr. Lawson*); after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to

LLANDAFF, Bishop of
Clerical Subscription, Report, Amendt. [179] 1047, 1050

Local Government Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 58]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Considered in Committee, and reported with amended title *April* 25, [178] 1034
Considered * *April* 26
Read 3° * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 28
Read 2ª * *May* 4 (No. 72)
Committee *; Report *May* 5
Read 3ª * *May* 8
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 24]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 108]
Read 2° * *April* 24
Committee *; Report *April* 26
Read 3° * *April* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 28
Read 2ª * *May* 4 (No. 73)
Committee *; Report *May* 5
Read 3ª * *May* 8
Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 25]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 26
Read 2° * and referred to a Select Committee *April* 27 [Bill 118]
Report * *May* 18 [Bill 152]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 25
Read 3° * *May* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 29
Read 2ª * *June* 12 (No. 127)
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3ª * *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 41]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 132]
Read 2° * and referred to a Select Committee *May* 12
Report * *May* 30
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Read 3° * *June* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 2 (No. 144)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 15, [180] 253; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Read 2ª and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
Report * *June* 23
Committee * *June* 26 (No. 208)
Report * *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 108]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 13 [Bill 209]
Read 2° * and referred to a Select Committee *June* 20
Committee * *June* 22; Report * *June* 23
Considered as amended * *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 223)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 110]

LOCKE, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Services, [178] 262
Church Attendance on Sunday, Leave, [177] 948
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 507
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 838
Inclosure, 2R. [178] 540
Income Tax Papers, [178] 670
Inns of Court, 2R. Amendt. [178] 1047, 1053
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1056
Navy Estimates—Wages to Artificers at Home, [178] 949
New Cross Roads, 2R. Amendt. [177] 496
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 725
Prisoners in Newgate, Treatment of, [177] 599, 1022, 1024, 1026
Probate, Court of, [178] 86

[*cont.*

Locke, Mr. J.—*cont.*
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1346
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 415
Supply — Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 257;—Rates for Government Property, 603; —Woods, Forests, &c. 707, 708, 710;—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 492, 496
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 229
Theatres, &c. Leave, [177] 1529; 2R. [179] 104; [180] 178, 183, 332
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [180] 688, 844, 846
Union Chargeability, Leave, [177] 484; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 515, 518
Westminster Bridge (Metropolis), [177] 208
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 776

Locomotives on Roads Bill
(*Mr. Holland, Sir E. Dering, Sir John Hay*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 9
Read 1°* *Mar* 10 [Bill 63]
Read 2°* *April* 5
Considered in Committee; and, after long debate, reported *April* 26, [178] 1060 [Bill 116]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *May* 15, [179] 372; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Greenwood*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," agreed to; main Question agreed to [Bills 143 & 246]
Read 3° *May* 15
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Hardwicke*) *May* 16
Read 2ª, after short debate, and referred to a Select Committee *May* 26, 867 (No. 108)
And, on June 12, Committee appointed and nominated as follows:—D. Richmond, D. Sutherland, M. Salisbury, E. Caithness, E. Hardwicke, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, V. Melville, V. Eversley, L. Silchester, L. Rossie, L. Stanley of Alderley; June 13, L. Harris added in the place of D. Sutherland, E. De Grey in the place of L. Stanley of Alderley, and E. Ducie, V. Strathallan, L. Calthorpe, and L. Wenlock added; June 14, E. of Malmesbury added
Report* *June* 16 (No. 164)
Committee* *June* 20; Report* *June* 22
Read 3ª* *June* 26
Commons Amendts. and Reasons (No. 237)
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 83]

London, Bishop of
Burial Service, Res. [180] 1031
Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster, Paper moved for, [180] 705
Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 972
Companies Workmens' Education, Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 956
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [179] 186; [180] 340
Imperial Gas, 2R. [179] 864
Imperial Gas Company's Works at Chelsea, [179] 108
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 648
Standing Order No. 191—Displacement of London Poor, [178] 875

London Brokers' Bill
(*Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Hankey, Mr. T. J. Miller*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 25 [Bill 167]

Long, Mr. R. P., *Chippenham*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 64, 70, 71
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1155
Highways Act, [178] 84
Medical Officers of Poor Law Unions, [177] 235
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 170

Longfield, Mr. R., *Mallow*
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries), Res. [180] 528
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 266
Game (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1528
Ireland—Patent and Close Rolls, [177] 1829
Juries in Criminal Cases, 2R. [177] 1724
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 314
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 879, 880, 894, 913
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 64
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 855
Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 32, [180] 364; Consid. *cl.* 31, 592
Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), [179] 1308
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 758

Longford, Earl of
Army—Military Hospitals at Netley and Woolwich, [177] 1113;—Issue of Commissions, [180] 971
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Report, Amendt. [178] 273
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 438
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1035
Courts of Justice Site, [177] 415; Returns moved for, 1918
Destitute Poor (Metropolis), Returns moved for, [177] 98
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 555
Indian Army, The, [180] 1159
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 870
Metropolitan Sewage—Report of Select Committee, [177] 636
Poor Relief (Metropolis) Act (1864), Return moved for, [177] 202
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), 2R. [179] 559

Lord Chancellor, Resignation of the
Observations, Earl Granville *July* 4, [180] 1142; Observations, Viscount Palmerston, 1163; Personal Statement of The Lord Chancellor *July* 5, 1174

Lotteries—Public Departments
Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, [179] 1268

Lowe, Right Hon. R., *Calne*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 148
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1423
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1578

[*cont.*

LOWE, Right Hon. R.—*cont.*
  Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 869
  Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 579
  Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 766
  Patent Laws, [180] 448
  Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 570
  Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1861
  Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 777

Lunacy Law
  Observations, Mr. Neate *May* 30, [179] 1114 [House counted out]

Lunatic Asylum Act (1853), &c., Amendment Bill (*Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Pugh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 2 [Bill 196]
  Read 2° * *June* 8
  Committee *; Report *June* 12
  Considered as amended * *June* 13
  Read 3° * *June* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Cawdor*) *June* 15 (No. 160)
  Read 2ª * *June* 19
  Committee * Report *June* 22
  Read 3ª * *June* 23
  Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 80]

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Blake, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26 [Bill 171]
  Bill withdrawn * *June* 21

LYALL, Mr. G., *Whitehaven*
  Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 669
  Custom House Charges, [180] 45
  Customs, Out Door Officers of, [178] 669, 1217
  Mines and Timber, Rating of, [177] 659
  Mauritius—Military Defence, [177] 1743
  Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 466
  Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1014

LYGON, Hon. F., *Worcestershire, W.*
  Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 848
  Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 875
  Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 931; Comm. [178] 180; Amendt. 490
  Dockyard Extensions, Comm. [179] 950; *cl.* 1, 951, 952
  Educational and Charitable Institutions, Leave, [178] 628; 2R. [180] 608, 616
  Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1010; Comm. *cl.* 11, [179] 1324
  Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1305, 1307
  Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 182
  Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Leave, [178] 1026
  Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. [179] 706;—Office of Works, &c. 946
  Union Chargeability, Comm. Adj. moved, [179] 172
  Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1460; [178] 1022

LYTTELTON, Lord
  Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 432
  Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 969; *cl.* 4, 974
  Education, National, [177] 1734
  Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 696, 701
  Public Schools, 2R. [178] 664, 749
  Union Chargeability, 3R. [180] 524

LYTTON, Right Hon. Sir E. G. Bulwer, *Hertfordshire*
  Malt, Res. [177] 1242

LYVEDEN, Lord
  British Kaffraria, 2R. [177] 1532
  Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 416, 424, 440
  Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [180] 937
  East India (Governor General's Powers), Comm. [178] 870, 872
  Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 23
  India—Officers of the late East India Company's Army, [179] 274
  Public Schools, Nomination of Comm. [178] 1458
  Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 819
  Union Chargeability, Comm. [180] 355

MACEVOY, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
  Ireland—Medical Officers in Unions, Res. [177] 1516
  Lunatics in Gaols (Ireland), [179] 591

MACKINNON, Mr. W. A., *Rye*
  Courts of Conciliation, [178] 489

MCMAHON, Mr. P., *Wexford Co.*
  Belfast—Riots at, [177] 375; Res. [180] 161
  Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1517
  Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 16, [180] 305
  Ireland—The Brehon Laws, [177] 748;—State of, Res. 785
  Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 603
  Law of Evidence, 2R. [177] 942
  Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 321
  Railway Clauses, Comm. [180] 620
  Roman Catholic Oath, [179] 743
  Sea Fisheries, [177] 748
  Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 467
  Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 601, 604;—Board of Trade, 610;—Printing and Stationery, 1146;—County Courts, 1149;—Law Charges, &c. (Ireland), 1150;—Constabulary (Ireland), 1151
  Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 757

MAGUIRE, Mr. J. F., *Dungarvan*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 67, 71
  Army Estimates—Military Education, [178] 257, 259, 261
  Belfast—Riots at, [177] 404, 408; Res. [180] 164

[*cont.*

MAGUIRE, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
Brazil and Uruguay, [177] 138, 658;—The River Plate, 1371
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 835
Greenwich Union—Cases of Mary Moriarty and others, [177] 596
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1152
Ireland—Court of Admiralty, [177] 83;—Removal of Paupers, 83;—State of, Res. 727, 728
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 570, 619, 623
Navy Estimates—New Works, &c. [179] 931
Navy—Mr. Clare's Patents, [177] 449
Paper Trade, Res. [179] 745, 760, 766
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 323; 2R. Amendt. 509
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Comm. [178] 956; [180] 754
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1908

MALINS, Mr. R., *Wallingford*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 653
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [178] 988
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 626
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 857; Consid. *cl.* 20, [180] 847
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 526
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 190, 193; 2R. 297
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 496; Lords Amendts. [179] 1185
Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 43
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 318
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 780
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 277
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1296
Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1172
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 854; Comm. 1183
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 223

MALMESBURY, Earl of
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [180] 111, 1157
Army—Barracks (Ireland), [177] 1462
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 696
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 432
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1037
Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 188, 193
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 256
Princess of Wales, Address moved, [180] 109
Public House Closing Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, [180] 115
Public Schools, [178] 746
Ryan, Mary—Case of, [177] 1651
Salmon Fishery Act Amendment, Comm. [180] 857; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 858
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 33

Malt—Resolution
177] Moved, "That in any future remission of Indirect Taxation, this House should take into consideration the Duty on Malt, with a view to its early reduction and ultimate repeal" (*Sir FitzRoy Kelly*) *Mar* 7, 1223
. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "considering the immunities from taxation now enjoyed by the owners and occupiers of land, they are not entitled to any special consideration on account of the pecuniary pressure of the Malt Tax, &c." (*Mr. Neate*), 1252; Question, "That the words," &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
. Original Question again proposed; Whereupon previous Question, "That that Question be now put" (*Mr. Hardcastle*); A. 171, N. 251; M. 80; Division List, 1298

Malt Duty Bill
(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Read 1° * *May* 19 [Bill 160]
Read 2° * *June* 1
Order for Committee read *June* 15
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), [180] 264; after long debate, Motion agreed to
Committee; Report *June* 15, 278
Considered as amended * *June* 19
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 22 (No. 181)
Committee *; Report *June* 23
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 66]

Malt for Cattle
Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, Mr. Hutt *Feb* 17, [177] 321

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R., *Leicestershire, N.*
Business, Public, [178] 1204
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 94
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 180
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1146
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 827
Supply—National Gallery, [179] 1260, 1273
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 293; Comm. [179] 172, 346

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 10
Read 2° * *Mar* 20
Committee *; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3° * *Mar* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Somerset*) *Mar* 30
Read 2ª * *Mar* 31
Committee *; Report *April* 3
Read 3ª * *April* 4
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 12]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
District Church Tithes, 2R. [178] 1074
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [179] 720
Railway Passengers, [180] 435

Marriage Certificates, Stamp Duties on
Question, Sir James Fergusson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 15, [179] 298

Marriage Law, The
Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 20, [177] 447

Marriages (Lambourne) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Bishop of Oxford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 4 (No. 83)
Read 2ª after short debate *May* 9, [178] 1
Considered in Committee; Amendt. proposed; New Clause (*The Bishop of Oxford*) *May* 12, [179] 188; after debate, Amendt. negatived; Bill reported *May* 12
Read 3ª* *May* 16
c. Read 1º* *June* 23 [Bill 237]
Read 2º* *June* 26
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Read 3º* *June* 28
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 81]

Married Women's Property (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Longfield, Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Leader*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 3 [Bill 60]
Read 2º* *Mar* 22
Committee*; Report *Mar* 28
Considered* *Mar* 29
Read 3º* *Mar* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 31
Read 2ª* *May* 4 (No. 53)
Committee* *May* 15; Report* *May* 16
Read 3ª* *May* 18 (No. 70)
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 43]

MARSH, Mr. M. H., *Salisbury*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, Address moved, [179] 880
British Kaffraria, Comm. [177] 1097
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1517, 1519
Colonial Naval Defence, Comm. [177] 1823
Colonies, Protection of the, [179] 905
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 514
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1137
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1500
Private Bills, Standing Order No. 7, [177] 111
Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), [179] 1308;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1309;—Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, 1311

MARTIN, Mr. P. Wykeham, *Rochester*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 1062; *cl.* 4, 1067
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [178] 732;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 949

Master and Servant
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the state of the Law as regards Contracts of Service between Master and Servant, and as to the expediency of amending the same" (*Mr. Cobbett*) *April* 7, [178] 956

Master and Servant—cont.
And, on May 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cobbett (Chairman), Lord Elcho, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Edmund Potter, Lord Stanley, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Clive, and Mr. Cox
Report *June* 15—(*Parl. P.* No. 370)

Master Manufacturers — Rental on Machinery
Question, Sir Robert Clifton; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 20, [180] 540

Masters and Operatives Bill
(*Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 8 (No. 92)

Mauritius, The—Contribution for Military Defence
Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, [177] 1742

Mayne, Sir Richard, and the Barnet Magistrates
Observations, Mr. Adderley; Reply, Sir George Grey *April* 3, [178] 719

MELVILLE, Viscount
Locomotives on Roads, 2R. [179] 870

Merchant Shipping Disputes Bill
(*Mr. Denman, Mr. Clay*)
c. Ordered; read 1º *Mar* 24, [178] 268 [Bill 90]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" (*Mr. Denman*) *June* 21, [180] 599; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Metalliferous Mines, 1865, Bill
(*Lord Kinnaird*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Mar* 30, [178] 479
After debate, Order for the second reading read and discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 22, [179] 621 (No. 49)

Metalliferous Mines (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Rosse*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 15 (No. 163)

Metropolis
Casual Poor, Question, The Marquess Townshend; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 21, [178] 3
Destitute Poor, Motion for Returns (*Lord Houghton*) *Feb* 9, [177] 96
Dwellings, Destruction of, by Railways, &c., Amendment of Standing Order No. 191 moved (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *Mar* 31, [178] 543; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Hyde Park, Gardens in, Question, Mr. Blackburn; Answer, Mr. W. F. Cowper *Mar* 17, [177] 1830
Leicester Square, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 9, [177] 1368

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.

London, Fires in, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *Mar* 21, [178] 7

Main Drainage, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Tite *Feb* 13, [177] 205

Metropolitan Paving, &c., Moved, To appoint a Commission, &c. (*Sir William Fraser*) *June* 13, [180] 132; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Newington Green and Hornsey Road, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. T. Baring *May* 1, [178] 1239

Night Refuges, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 20, [177] 1920

Ownerless Dogs, Question, Mr. Dawson-Damer; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 16, [180] 365

Park Lane, Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Mr. Cowper *April* 7, [178] 889

Parochial Medical Relief, Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 31, [178] 568

Police Rate, Observations, Mr. Cox; Reply, Sir George Grey *Mar* 17, [177] 1900

Regent's Park—Bridge over the Canal, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 23, [177] 600

St. James' Park, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 9, [179] 1347

Sewage (*Metropolis*), Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Tite *Mar* 10, [177] 1479;—*Report of the Select Committee,* Observations, The Earl of Longford *Feb* 24, 636; debate thereon; Explanation, The Earl of Essex *Feb* 27, 735

Thames Embankment, The, Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 22, [180] 633

Upper Street, Islington, State of, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 12, [179] 238

Wellington's, Duke of, Monument at St. Paul's, Question, Sir M. Farquhar; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 23, [178] 80

Westminster Bridge, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 13, [177] 208

See *Commons and Open Spaces*

Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation Bill (*by Order*)

177] *c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir William Russell*) *Feb* 28, 832

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six weeks" (*Mr. Crawford*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

. Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee; Instruction to the Committee (*Mr. Ayrton*), 845

Select Committee nominated March 9 as follows:—The Judge Advocate (Chairman), [added March 13], Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Knight, Mr. Brady, Mr. Taverner John Miller, Mr. Clay, Mr. Paget, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Colonel Smyth, and Mr. Charles Turner

178] Considered as amended; further consideration deferred *April* 7, 881

. Bill further considered; Read 3° *April* 25, 1000

179] *l.* Read 3ª after short debate *June* 1, 1115; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons

Metropolitan Houseless Poor Bill
(*Mr. C. P. Villiers, Viscount Enfield*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20 [Bill 83]

178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. C. P. Villiers*) *Mar* 30, 533; after debate, Motion agreed to; Read 2° *Mar* 30

. Committee; Report *April* 5, 756

. Considered as amended *April* 6, 859

Read 3°* *April* 24 [Bill 162]

l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *April* 27 (No. 70)

179] Read 2ª after short debate *May* 12, 192

. Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee *May* 16, 378; after debate, Motion agreed to; Bill considered in Committee *May* 16

Report* *May* 18

Read 3ª* *May* 19

Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 34]

Metropolitan Main Drainage [*Guarantee of Repayment of Money*] *Bill*

c. Considered in Committee *Mar* 13, [177] 1644

Report *Mar* 14

Metropolitan Main Drainage Extension Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14 [Bill 73]

Read 2°* *Mar* 15

Committee*; Report *Mar* 16

Read 3°* *Mar* 17

l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *Mar* 20

Read 2ª* *May* 1 (No. 40)

Committee*; Report *May* 2

Read 3ª* *May* 4

Royal Assent *May* 9 [28 *Vict.* c. 19]

Metropolitan Toll Bridges Bill
(*Mr. Ald. Salomons, Mr. Locke, Mr. Jackson*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 1 [Bill 47]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Alderman Salomons*) *April* 26, [178] 1053

Read 2° after debate, and committed to a Select Committee *April* 26

Instruction, "to inquire into the existing Tolls on Roads and Bridges within the Metropolis, and the best means of abolishing them" (*Mr. Ayrton*)

And, on May 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Alderman Salomons (Chairman), Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Jackson, Sir Baldwin Leighton, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Charles Turner, Sir John Shelley, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Adam, Sir William Jolliffe, Mr. Cowper, Lord John Manners, Mr. Hanbury, and Mr. Tite; *May* 12, Mr. Leader added

Special Report *June* 19—(*Parl. P.* No. 380)

Middlesex Industrial Schools Bill

c. Order [11th May] that the Report from the Select Committee on the Middlesex Industrial Schools Bill do lie upon the Table read

[*cont.*

Middlesex Industrial Schools Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the said order be discharged" (*Mr. Doulton*); Question negatived *May* 29, [179] 975; after debate, Bill committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 30, [178] 486
Moved, "That the Middlesex Industrial Schools Bill, as amended in the Committee, be taken into Consideration To-morrow" (*Mr. Hennessy*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn *June* 8, 1263
And, on April 3, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir William Jolliffe (Chairman), Mr. Baring, Mr. Cave, Viscount Enfield, Mr. Greenwood, Lord Edward Howard, Sir William Miles, Mr. Salt, Sir John Trollope, and Whitbread

MILES, Sir W., *Somersetshire, E.*
Colonial Naval Defence, Leave, [177] 1029
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1200
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1063; *cl.* 4, 1067
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1200
Police Superannuation, Comm. *add. cl.* [178] 1072
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 336; Comm. [179] 128, 171, 353; *cl.* 2, 501

Militia Ballots Suspension Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Peel*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 26
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 2
Read 3° * *June* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 12
Read 2ª * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Read 3ª * *June* 16
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 46]

Militia Pay Bill
(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 21
Presented; read 1° * *May* 26
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 2
Read 3° * *June* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 12
Read 2ª * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Read 3ª * *June* 16
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 47]

Militia—Reviews of the
Question, Lord Burghley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 20, [180] 538
The 3rd Middlesex, Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 8, 178] 1598

MILLER, Mr. T. J., *Colchester*
India—Kirwee Prize Money, [177] 288
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 594
Reformatory Children, Exhibition of, [178] 1001
Westminster Improvement Commission, Return moved for, [179] 210

MILLER, Mr. W., *Leith*
Indian Medal, The, [179] 302, 563

MILLS, Mr. A., *Taunton*
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Comm. [179] 95
British Kaffraria, [177] 237; Comm. 1093, 1098; *cl.* 17, 1099
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1030
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 499
Easter Recess, The, [178] 202
India—Transport of Troops to, [179] 116;—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, 393, 420;—The Budget, [180] 260
New Zealand—War in, [177] 289, 290, 1481, 1747;—Affairs of, [179] 879
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved, [178] 221
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 98
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 570
Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 442
Workhouse Nurses, [178] 1533

MILLS, Mr. J. REMINGTON, *Wycombe* (*Chepping*)
Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. Amendt. [180] 610
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 838
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [179] 1300

Mines, Condition of
Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 8, [178] 1599
Regulation Act, Select Committee appointed "To inquire into the operation of the Act for the regulation and inspection of Mines, and into the complaints contained in Petitions from Miners in Great Britain with reference thereto, which have been presented to the House during the present Session (*Mr. Ayrton*) *May* 9, [179] 72
And, on May 29, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ayrton (Chairman), Mr. Liddell, Mr. Neate, Mr. Greenall, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Francis Sharp Powell, Mr. Jackson, Colonel Dunne, Mr. Clive, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Lord Robert Cecil, and Mr. Bruce
Report *June* 22—(*Parl. P.* No. 398)
Report upon, Question, Lord Kinnaird; Answer, Lord Vivian *May* 16, [179] 387

MITCHELL, Mr. T. A., *Bridport*
Singapore—Transfer of, [179] 389

MITFORD, Mr. W. T., *Midhurst*
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1655
Poor Law, [177] 1115
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 19, [179] 1329
Supply—National Gallery, [179] 1274
Union Chargeability, 3R. [179] 800

Moffatt, Mr. G., *Honiton*
- Bankruptcy Act, Select Committee moved for, [177] 120
- Bankruptcy Act (1861), Res. [179] 420, 1109
- Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the, [179] 214
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, Amendt. [178] 1471, 1477, 1480

Monastic and Conventual Establishments
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the existence, character, and increase of Monastic or Conventual Societies or Establishments in Great Britain" (*Mr. Newdegate*), [177] 1045; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, A. 106, N. 79; M. 27; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1086

Moncreiff, Right Hon. J., *see* **Advocate**, The **Lord**

Monsell, Right Hon. W., *Limerick Co.*
- Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, [177] 1974
- Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1934
- Ireland — State of, Res. [177] 702;—Railway System, [178] 673; Address moved, 896, 925; [180] 927;—Titles to Land, 888
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 616, 617
- Record of Title (Ireland), Comm. [179] 1181
- Roman Catholic Oath, Leave, [178] 24; 2R. [179] 451; Comm. 612, 618, 620, 742, 1036, 1097; 3R. [180] 325
- St. John, Mr., Case of, [179] 788
- Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1251, 1258
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 245
- University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 564, 565

Montagu, Lord R., *Huntingdonshire*
- Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 140
- Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. Amendt. [177] 490
- Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. Amendt. [180] 287
- Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 841
- Navy—Accounts, &c. [177] 501;—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 390, 400
- Police—Houses of Parliament, [179] 1102;—at Public Buildings, [180] 131
- Pollution of Rivers, [179] 1101
- Public Accounts, Committee of, [177] 320
- River Waters Protection, Leave, [177] 127; 2R. 1309, 1333, 1357
- Sewage Utilization, Leave, [177] 127; 2R. 1360
- Stonor, Mr., Appointment of, [178] 563, 567
- Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1142, 1145, 1146;—Probate Court, 1147

Montgomery, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
- Volunteer Sergeant Instructors, Allowances to, [178] 86

Montrose, Duke of
- Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1222
- Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 695
- Edmunds, Leonard — Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1217
- Railway Passengers, [180] 436

Moor, Mr. H., *Brighton*
- Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 2R. [179] 1024; Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [180] 667
- Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 5, [179] 1317
- Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1286; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [179] 526; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 528
- Police Superannuation, Comm. *cl.* 5, [178] 1071
- Supply — Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, [179] 1311, 1312
- Transportation to Australia, [177] 137

Moore, Mr. C., *Tipperary*
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 597
- Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 757
- University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 586

Moore, Mr. J. B., *Lincoln*
- Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 604

Morocco, Jews in
- Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 27, [178] 1082

Morritt, Mr. W. J. S., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
- Army — Sentences of Courts Martial, [177] 1042
- Malt, Res. [177] 1269

Mortality among Children in Norfolk
- Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 31, [178] 562; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 24, 958

Mortgage Debentures Bill
(*Lord Naas, Colonel Greville*)
- c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 8 [Bill 1]
- Read 2°, after long debate, and committed to a Select Committee *Feb* 15, [177] 262
- And, on Feb 17, Committee nominated as follows:—The Judge Advocate (Chairman), Lord Naas, Lord Stanley, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Scully, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Goschen, Mr. George Grenfell Glyn, Sir James Elphinstone, Mr. Hodgkinson, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Howes, Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, and Mr. Peel; Feb 20, Mr. Hunt added; Feb 21, Mr. Longfield and Mr. Pollard-Urquhart added
- Report of Select Committee * *Mar* 14
- Considered in Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *Mar* 28, [178] 455 [Bills 72 & 119]
- Committee *; Report *April* 27
- Considered * *May* 3
- Read 3° * *May* 15 [Bill 240]

[*cont.*

Mortgage Debentures Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) *May* 16
Read 2ª after debate *May* 23, [179] 719 (No. 107)
Committee*; Report *June* 13
Referred to a Select Committee and nominated June 15 as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, D. Marlborough, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, E. Malmesbury, V. Hutchinson, L. Boyle, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Cranworth, L. St. Leonards, L. Chelmsford; June 16, E. Belmore, E. Grey, L. Redesdale added
Report of Select Committee *June* 19
Report *June* 22 (Nos. 173 & 174)
Read 3ª* *June* 23 (No. 206)
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 78]

Mortgage Debentures [*Stamps*]
Considered* *April* 25; Reported* *April* 26, [178]

Mowbray, Rt. Hon. J. R., *Durham City*
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 872, 873
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [178] 366
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 185

Mundy, Mr. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
Bishops Trusts Substitution Act, [180] 444
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 42, [179] 1330, 1331; Schedule 1, Amendt. 1332, 1334, 1335

Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 7, [177] 1301 [Bill 54]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Blake*) *June* 21, [180] 597; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Murphy, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Navy Estimates—New Works, &c. [179] 941
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 855; Comm. 1182

Murray, Mr. W., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Bankruptcy Act (1861), [178] 958
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 681; *cl.* 14, 682; Consid. *cl.* 20, Amendt. 847
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 526
Registrarship of the Court of Bankruptcy, Leeds, [179] 293

Mutiny Bill (*Mr. Dodson, The Marquess of Hartington, The Lord Advocate*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 17
Read 2°* *Mar* 20
Committee; Report *Mar* 27, [178] 363
Considered* *Mar* 28
Read 3°* *Mar* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *Mar* 30
Read 2ª* *Mar* 31
Committee*; Report *April* 3
Read 3ª* *April* 4
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 11]

Naas, Right Hon. Lord, *Cockermouth*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 255
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 834
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. Preamble, [179] 984, 985; *cl.* 3, 987; *cl.* 4, 990; *cl.* 8, 991, 992; *cl.* 9, 994; Consid. *add. cl.* [180] 105; *cl.* 3, 106
Ireland—Arterial Drainage, [177] 84;—Military occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1566, 1568
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 626
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [177] 262
Railway Debentures, &c. Registry, 2R. [180] 848
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 465
Supply—Bermudas, [179] 1280
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 756
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 266

National Gallery (Dublin) Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Luke White*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 203]
Read 2°* *June* 12
Committee*; Report *June* 19
Considered as amended* *June* 20
Read 3°* *June* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 22
Read 2ª* *June* 23 (No. 196)
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 71]

National Gallery—Mr. Frith's "Derby Day"
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 1, [178] 1238

Natural History, New Museum of
Question, Mr. Doulton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 26, [179] 876

Naval and Marine Pay and Pensions Bill
(*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 29 [Bill 182]
Read 2°* *June* 1
Committee*; Report *June* 1
Report* *June* 13
Considered as amended* *June* 15 [Bill 190]
Read 3°* *June* 16
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Somerset*) *June* 19
Read 2ª* *June* 23 (No. 177)
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 73]

Naval Discipline Act Amendment Bill
[H.L.] (*The Duke of Somerset*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 23 (No. 214)
Read 2ª* *June* 26
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 29
c. Read 1°* *June* 30 [Bill 254]
Read 2°* *July* 3
Committee*; Report *July* 3
Read 3°* *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 115]

NAVY

Accounts, &c., Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Peel *Feb* 21, [177] 501

"*Achilles,*" *The*, Question, Mr. H. Baillie; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *April* 27, [178] 1081

Admiralty, Board of, Observations, Sir Morton Peto; Reply, Lord Clarence Paget; long debate thereon *April* 3, [178] 678

Armaments of Ships, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether Her Majesty's Ships are at present armed in a manner suited to the necessities and requirements of modern warfare" (*Mr. Henry Baillie*), [177] 962; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, A. 57, N. 22; M. 35

Armour-Plated Ships in the Channel Fleet, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Feb* 10, [177] 140

Assistant Surgeons, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 23, [180] 732

"*Bellerophon,*" *The*, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Lord C. Paget *May* 25, [179] 789

Bermuda, Docks at, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 13, [180] 132

"*Bombay,*" *Loss of the*, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 22, [180] 629

Bromley, Sir Richard, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 9, [179] 1335

Carriage of Treasure, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Lord C. Paget *May* 2, [178] 1316

Chaplain General of the, Observations, Sir Harry Verney, 1003; Reply, Mr. Childers *Mar* 2, [177] 1017

Chaplains in the, Question, Mr. Lefroy; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 13, [177] 1536

Chaplains' Quarterly Report, Question, Mr. Hanbury Tracy; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 30, [178] 488

Coles', Captain, Cupola, Question, Mr. Damer; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 14, [177] 1661

Cowes Trinity Pilots, Question, Mr. Clifford; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 23, [177] 600

Devonport Dockyard — Payment for Extra Time, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 16, [177] 1738

Dockyard Accommodation, Question, Sir S. Northcote; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 8, [178] 1603

Dockyard Accounts, Observations, Mr. Seely, 1010; Reply Mr. Childers *Mar* 2, [177] 1017

Dockyard Expenditure, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 6, [177] 1119

Dockyard Extensions, Observations, Sir Morton Peto; Reply, Lord Clarence Paget; debate thereon *May* 29, [179] 1036 — (See *Dockyard Extensions Bill*)

Dockyard Superannuation, Question, Sir A. Buller; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 20, [177] 422

Dockyard Superintendents, Question, Sir F. Smith; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 23, [180] 751; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to continue the practice of

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

appointing Naval Officers who are not possessed of a technical knowledge of the business carried on in Her Majesty's Dockyards to the offices of Superintendents thereof, and the practice of limiting their tenure of office to a period of five years" (*Mr. Seely*), [180] 369; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, A. 34, N. 36; M. 2; after further short debate, A. 33, N. 60; M. 27, 389 — (See title *Dockyard Ports Regulation Bill*)

Dockyards, Wages in, Observations, Mr. Ferrand; Reply, Mr. Childers *Mar* 6, [177] 1136

Estimates, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 27, [177] 750; Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 18, [179] 487

ESTIMATES—see SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES

"*Galatea,*" *Rumoured Loss of the*, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 2, [177] 961

Greenwich Hospital, Question, Sir Morton Peto; Answer, Mr. Childers *Mar* 20, [177] 1923—(*Parl. P.* No. 222)—(see *Greenwich Hospital Bill*)

Marines, Recruits for the, Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 22, [179] 641

Master, Rank of, Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 31, [178] 567

Masters and Staff Commanders, Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 5, [177] 959

Masters in the Navy, Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *May* 16, [179] 384; Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *May* 26, 878; Question, Mr. Corry; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 30, [180] 983

Naval Reserves, Observations, Mr. Corry; Reply, Lord C. Paget *June* 23, [180] 738

North Pole, Expedition to the, Question, Mr. W. O. Stanley; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *Mar* 31, [178] 563

Portsmouth Dockyard, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 6, [177] 1117

Reserved List, Captains on the, Observations, Lord Chelmsford; Reply, The Duke of Somerset *June* 30, [180] 975

"*Royal Sovereign,*" *Repairs of the, &c.*, Question, Sir James Elphinstone; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 21, [177] 501; Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Mar* 2, 961

Sayer's Lifeboat, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Lord C. Paget *Feb* 24, [177] 659

Sheerness Dockyard, Question, Sir Edward Dering; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 19, [180] 469

Warrant Officers, Widows of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "the cruel exception which deprives those Widows of Warrant Officers of the Navy who became Widows prior to 1860 of any Pension is not approved by this House" (*Sir John Hay*), [179] 577; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, A. 62, N. 42; M. 20; Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *June* 30, [180] 980

"*Wreck Abstract,*" Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. M. Gibson *Mar* 14, [177] 1662

Navy and Army Expenditure (1864-5)
Considered in Committee *June* 15, [180] 331; Resolutions, Lord Clarence Paget and The Marquess of Hartington, agreed to—(see *Army*)

Navy and Marines (Property of Deceased) Bill (*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 29 [Bill 181]
Read 2º * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Report * *June* 13
Considered as amended * *June* 15 [Bill 189]
Read 3º * *June* 16 [Bill 253]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Somerset*) *June* 19
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 176)
Committee * *June* 26
Report * *June* 27 (No. 220)
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 111]

Navy and Marines (Wills) Bill (*Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Childers*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 29 [Bill 180]
Read 2º * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 1
Report * *June* 13
Read 3º * *June* 15 [Bill 188]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Somerset*) *June* 16
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 169)
Committee *; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 72]

Nazareth—Church at
Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 23, [178] 79

NEATE, Mr. C., *Oxford City*
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1696
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, Address moved, [179] 880
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1258; *add. cl.* 1272; 3R. [179] 804
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 491
Church Attendance on Sunday, Leave, [177] 948
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 92
Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 840
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [180] 674
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1199
Indian Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 399
Inns of Court, 2R. [178] 1049
Ireland—Medical Officers in Unions, Res. [177] 1522
Lunacy Law, [179] 1114
Malt, Res. Amendt. [177] 1252, 1298
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, Comm. *add. cl.* [178] 759
Monastic and Conventual Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1069
[*cont.*

NEATE, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 390
Office of Works, Comm. moved for, [178] 15
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 96, 102; Comm. 727
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 204
Prisons, Leave, [177] 220; 3R. [180] 123
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 234
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 230
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 332; Comm. [179] 119
Wakefield Gaol, [177] 1087

New Cross Roads Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be read 2º upon this day fortnight" (*Mr. Angerstein*) *Feb* 21, [177] 496
Amendt. to leave out "fortnight," and insert "six months" (*Mr. Locke*); after debate, Question, "That the word 'fortnight' stand part of the Question," negatived
Bill put off for six months

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1994, 1997
Belfast—Riots at, [177] 407, 408
*Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 74
Clerical Subscription, Consid. [180] 879
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 513
France—Commercial Treaty with, [177] 1755
Ireland—Circulation of Lottery Tickets, [179] 1321
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 650
Monastic and Conventual Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1045, 1080; Explanation, 1638, 1643
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1297
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 98; Comm. 728
Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 468
Pope, Rumoured residence of the, in England, [178] 568
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 2R. [177] 210; 3R. [178] 184, 186
Roman Catholic Oath, Leave, [178] 31; Comm. Amendt. [179] 1051, 1085; *cl.* 1, [180] 83; 3R. 328
Theatres, &c. 2R. Adj. moved, [180] 182
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 353; Comm. [179] 131
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 574
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1482
Westminster Palace Crypt, [178] 1468

Newgate, Treatment of Prisoners in
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 23, [177] 599; Observations, Mr. Locke; Reply, Sir George Grey *Mar* 2, 1022

Newington Green and Hornsey Road
Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. T. Baring *May* 1, [178] 1239

New Members Sworn
Feb 7. Lord Courtenay, *Exeter* (*New Writ issued July* 29)
Lord Augustus Henry Charles Hervey, *Suffolk County* (*Western Division*)
William Davenport Bromley, esq., *Warwick County* (*Northern Division*)
William Morris, esq., *Carmarthen Borough*
Hon. George Waldegrave-Leslie, *Hastings*
Feb 9. Hon. George Frederick Boyle, *Bute County*
Feb 16. John Cheetham, esq. *Salford*
Feb 21. Frederick Martin Williams, esq., *Truro*
Feb 24. Henry William Schneider, esq., *Lancaster Borough*
Feb 27. Nicholas Daniel Murphy, esq., *Cork City*
Mar 6. Charles Moore, esq., *Tipperary County*
Mar 7. Daniel O'Donoghue, esq., commonly called The O'Donoghue, *Tralee*
Mar 21. Lord Charles Bruce, *Wilts* (*Northern Division*)
April 3. Thomas Dyke Acland the younger, esq., *Devon* (*Northern Division*)
April 6. James Bourne, Esq., *Evesham*
April 24. Hon. Percy Egerton Herbert, *Salop* (*Southern Division*)
William Patrick Adam, esq., *Clackmannan and Kinross Shires*
Thomas Bayley Potter, esq., *Rochdale*
George Young, esq., *Wigton, &c., Burghs*
May 4. Tristram Kennedy, esq., *Louth*
May 9. James Clarke Lawrence, esq., *Lambeth*
June 22. Henry William Eaton, esq., *Coventry*
June 23. Thomas Brassey, esq., the younger, *Devonport*
June 26. Sir Arthur William Buller, Knight, *Liskeard*

New Writs during the Recess
For Hastings, *v.* Lord Harry Vane, now Duke of Cleveland
For Carmarthen Borough, *v.* David Morris, esquire, deceased
For Suffolk County (Western Division), *v.* Earl Jermyn, now Marquess of Bristol
For Warwick County (Northern Division), *v.* Richard Spooner, esquire, deceased
For Bute County, *v.* David Mure, esquire, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland

New Writs issued
Feb 7—*For* Tralee, *v.* Right Hon. Thomas O'Hagan, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland
Feb 7—*For* Cork City, *v.* Francis Lyons, esquire, Steward of Hempholme
Feb 7—*For* Salford, *v.* Right Hon. William Nathaniel Massey, Member of the Council of India
Feb 7—*For* Truro, *v.* Montague Edward Smith, esquire, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas
[*cont.*

New Writs issued—cont.
Feb 13—*For* Tipperary County, *v.* The O'Donoghue, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 14—*For* Lancaster Borough, *v.* Samuel Gregson, esquire, deceased
Mar 9—*For* Wilts (Northern Division), *v.* The Right Hon. Sutton Sotheron Estcourt, Manor of Northstead
Mar 22—*For* Devon (Northern Division), *v.* James Wentworth Buller, esquire, deceased
Mar 30—*For* Louth, *v.* Richard Montesquieu Bellew, esquire, Commissioner of Poor Laws in Ireland
Mar 30—*For* Evesham, *v.* Sir Henry Pollard Willoughby, bart., deceased
April 5—*For* Salop (Southern Division), *v.* Viscount Newport, now Earl of Bradford
April 7—*For* Rochdale, *v.* Richard Cobden, esquire, deceased
April 7—*For* Wigton District of Burghs, *v.* Sir William Dunbar, bart., Commissioner of Auditing the Public Accounts
April 7—*For* Clackmannan and Kinross Shires, *v.* William Patrick Adam, esquire, Commissioner of the Treasury
May 4—*For* Lambeth, *v.* William Williams, esquire, deceased
June 15—*For* Liskeard, *v.* Ralph Osborne, esquire, Manor of Hempholme
June 15—*For* Coventry, *v.* Sir Joseph Paxton, deceased

New Zealand
Prize Money, Question, Mr. Kekewich; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 81
Separation of Provinces, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 30, [179] 1104
Troops in, Question, General Peel; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, [178] 82
War in, Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 16, [177] 289; Observations, Mr. Arthur Mills; long debate thereon; Reply of Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 10, 1481; Question, Sir John Trelawny; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Mar* 16, 1742; Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 6, [178] 785; Question, Mr. Western; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *April* 7, 893; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 26, [179] 879

NORRIS, Mr. J. T., *Abingdon*
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 845
Prisons, Leave, [177] 219; 2R. 1362

NORTH, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1791, 1793, 1820;—Pay and Allowances, 1822; Amendt. 1955, 1971;—Disembodied Militia, 1979;—Enrolled Pensioners, 1984;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, [178] 854, 857
Army—Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 523; [178] 372; [180] 539;—Contagious Diseases Prevention Act, [179]
[*cont.*

North, Colonel J. S.—*cont.*
562;—Rating of Houses of Officers, 587, 591, 640, 641;—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, 646
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 506
Infectious Patients in Workhouses, [177] 1533
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [178] 365
New Zealand—Renewal of hostilities in, [178] 785
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1488

North and South Shields, Ports of
Question, Sir Matthew Ridley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 4, [180] 1162

Northcote, Sir S. H., *Stamford*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1788; [178] 853;—Administration of the Army, 965
Army—The War Office, [177] 1830; [178] 202;—Employment of Dr. Sutherland, [180] 441
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1263; *cl.* 8, 1268, 1269
Bristol—Episcopal residence at, [180] 632
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 848
Chapter House, Westminster, [179] 488
Comptroller of the Exchequer and Public Audit, 2R. [180] 298
Education—School Grants, [178] 1465
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 1320; Consid. *cl.* 13, [180] 507
India—The Lucknow Booty, [178] 1601
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 807
Navy—Dockyard Accommodation, [178] 1603
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1163
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 53, Amendt. [179] 1331; Schedule 1, 1332
Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), [179] 1308
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1882
Ways and Means, Report, Exchequer Bonds, [178] 1709

Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day
Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 17, [177] 322

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 787
Belfast—Riots at, [177] 409
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 990
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 689
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 321
Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 183

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
Game (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [179] 372
Ireland—State of, Res. Adj. moved, [177] 733
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 606
Record of Title (Ireland), Comm. [179] 1182
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 466
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1253

O'Donoghue, The, *Tipperary Co.*
Belfast—Riots at, Res. [180] 158
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 392
Conventual Establishments, [177] 1642
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1217
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1259
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R. [178] 755
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 541, 590

Ogilvy, Sir J., *Dundee*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 538

O'Loghlen, Sir C., *Clare Co.*
Bank Notes (Ireland), 2R. [180] 604, 608
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. Amendt. [178] 785
Belfast—Riots at, Res. [180] 145
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 9, [179] 992
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 681
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries), Res. [180] 529
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 266
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 519
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 21, [179] 716; Consid. 859
Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 22, [180] 305; Preamble, 307
Juries in Criminal Cases, 2R. [177] 1717
Libel, Leave, [177] 561; 2R. [179] 785
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 8, [178] 1070
Lunatics in Gaols (Ireland), [179] 593
Marriage Law, [177] 447
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 55, [178] 369
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 57
Sheep and Cattle, 2R. [178] 470
Supply—Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, [179] 595;—New Record Buildings, Dublin, 595;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 600;—Board of Trade, Adj. moved, 611;—Printing and Stationery, 1140
Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland), [180] 758
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, Comm. *cl.* 3, [178] 268
Utilization of Sewage and Land Reclamation (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [178] 6, 7

Onslow, Mr. G., *Guildford*
Russia—Epidemic in, [178] 889

Open Spaces (*Metropolis*)—See *Commons and Open Spaces*

Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the
Observations, Mr. Digby Seymour; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 12, [179] 211

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [177] 88
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1805;—Pay and Allowances, 1957, 1969
Army—Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 515, 534;—Irish or Roman Catholic Recruits, 1739; [179] 639
Belfast—Commission of Inquiry, [177] 119;—Riots at, 320, 390; Res. [180] 140, 148, 164
Chain Cables and Anchors, [180] 737
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 9, [179] 993
Election Petitions Act (1848) Amendment, Comm. [177] 633
Forms of the House, [180] 410
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 777;—Poor Law Board, 1661;—School Reports, [179] 875, 876;—Case of Patrick Donohue, [180] 467, 468
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 512
Supply—Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, [179] 595;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 599
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 571, 583

Osborne, Mr. R. B., *Liskeard*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1440

Outlawries Bill
Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries" read 1° * *Feb* 7

Ownerless Dogs—Metropolis
Question, Mr. Dawson-Damer; Answer, Sir G. Grey *June* 16, [180] 365

Oxford, Bishop of
Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 971; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 973; *cl.* 4, 974; Report, Amendt. 1047
Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 703
Marriages (Lambourne), 2R. [179] 1; Comm. *add. cl.* 188, 189, 191
Russia—Epidemic in, [178] 744, 879

Oxford University (Vinerian Foundation) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Neate*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 7 [Bill 107]
Read 2° * *April* 24
Committee *; Report *April* 27
Considered * *May* 1
Read 3° * *May* 2
Lords Amendts. [Bill 175]
l. Read 1ᵃ * (*The Earl of Derby*) *May* 4 (No. 79)
Read 2ᵃ after short debate *May* 16, [179] 383
Committee *; Report *May* 19 (No. 115)
Read 3ᵃ * *May* 22
Commons Reasons (No. 150)
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 55]

Oyster Fishery
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 3, [178] 672

Packe, Colonel G. H., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Railways, [177] 237

Packe, Mr. C. W., *Leicestershire, S.*
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 654
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 97; Amendt. 100
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, Adj. moved, [177] 1306
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 119, 332; Consid. 664

Paget, Vice-Admiral Lord C. E. (Secretary of the Admiralty), *Sandwich*
Bermuda—Docks at, [180] 132
Colonial Docks, Loans, 2R. [180] 595
Cowes Trinity Pilots, [177] 600
Dockyard Extensions, 2R. [179] 540; Comm. 951; *cl.* 1, 952, 1037
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1012; 2R. [179] 996, 1006; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1318; *cl.* 10, 1319, 1321; *cl.* 11, 1323, 1325
Ireland—Royal Dock in Cork Harbour, [177] 116
Naval Reserve, [180] 745
Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1001
Navy—Armour-plated Ships in the Channel Fleet, [177] 140;—Mr. Clare's Patents, 449;—Superannuation in the Dockyards, 452;—Repairs of the "Royal Sovereign," &c. 501, 961;—Captain Sayer's Life Boat, 659;—Masters and Staff Commanders, 959; [179] 877, 878;—Rumoured Loss of the "Galatea," [177] 962;—Portsmouth Dockyard, 1117;—Dockyard Expenditure, 1120;—Captain Coles' Cupola, 1662;—Devonport Dockyard—Payment for Extra Time, 1739;—Rank of Master, [178] 568;—Board of Admiralty, 691;—The "Achilles," 1081;—Carriage of Treasure, 1307;—Widows of Warrant Officers, Res. [179] 580;—Recruits for the Marines, 641;—The "Bellerophon," 789;—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 381, 385, 387, 389;—Sheerness Dockyard, 470;—Loss of the "Bombay," 630;—Assistant Surgeons, 732
Navy Estimates, [177] 750;—Men and Boys, 1146, 1155, 1156, 1162, 1163, 1172, 1173, 1192, 1201, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1408, 1410, 1411, 1414, 1417, 1449, 1451, 1452, 1453, 1454, 1456;—Admiralty Office, [178] 726, 727;—Coast Guard Service, 728, 729, 730;—Scientific Departments, 731;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 733, 953;—Miscellaneous Services, 954, 955;—Half Pay, 997; [179] 487;—New Works, &c. 939, 940, 941
North Pole, Expedition to the, [178] 563
Supply—Report, [178] 1037, 1038

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J., *Droitwich*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 248, 253, 254
Bermuda—Docks at, [180] 132
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 834
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Leave, [178] 1519; 2R. [179] 1028; Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 513; *cl.* 4, 665; *cl.* 12, 669

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J.—*cont.*
- Education—Revised Code of Regulations, [177] 327;—Comm. moved for, 847, 924;—Endowments for, Minute of Council, [178] 1536
- Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 997, 1002, 1012, 1017; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1317; *cl.* 10, 1319; *cl.* 11, 1323; Consid. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [180] 500, 508
- Navy Estimates, [177] 750;—Men and Boys, 1155, 1162, 1171, 1173, 1402, 1405, 1406, 1410, 1411, 1448, 1453;—Admiralty Offices, [178] 727;—Coast Guard Service, 728, 729
- Navy—Rumoured loss of the "Galatea," [177] 961;—Rank of Master, [178] 567;—Board of Admiralty, 697;—Case of Sir R. Bromley, [179] 1335;—Assistant Surgeons, [180] 732
- Roman Catholic Oath, [179] 1035; Comm. 1074
- Russia—Epidemic in, [178] 784
- Supply—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 497
- Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 130

Palk, Sir L., *Devonshire, S.*
- Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 650
- Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 887;—Endowments for, Minute of Council, [178] 1537
- Great Western Railway, Accident on the, [179] 1337, 1342, 1345, 1346, 1347
- Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 51, [180] 127; *add. cl.* 130
- Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 911
- Navy—Masters and Staff Commanders, [177] 95; [179] 878
- Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1165, 1171

Palmer, Sir R., *see* **Attorney General**, The

Palmerston, Right Hon. Viscount (First Lord of the Treasury), *Tiverton*
- Adjournment of the House, [178] 894; [179] 1209
- Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 655, 660, 744; Address moved, 879
- Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [177] 1823, 2000;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 170;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 265
- Ballot, The, Res. [180] 425
- Bath, Order of the, Address moved, [180] 407
- Belfast—Riots at, [177] 354
- Brazil and Uruguay—The River Plate, [177] 1372
- Brazil—Diplomatic Relations with, [177] 1369
- Canada and the United States, Papers moved for, [177] 148;—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, 1633
- Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 455
- Civil Service Estimates, [178] 737, 743, 851
- Cobden, Mr., The late, [178] 673
- Confederate States, Belligerent Rights of the, [179] 296
- Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 937, 938
- Easter Recess, The, [178] 202
- Egypt—The Suez Canal, [177] 1044, 1760

[cont.

Palmerston, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*
- Gregson, Mr., The late, [177] 286
- Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 727, 821, 827
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 618, 619
- Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, [179] 744; [180] 912, 913; Res. Adj. moved, 1132, 1135
- Lord Chancellor, Resignation of the, [180] 1163
- Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 398, 400
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1201, 1456;—Naval Establishments at Home, [178] 732
- Parliament, Prorogation of the, [180] 914
- Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1843
- Poor Law Board, [177] 237;—Secretary to the, Res. 467
- Pope, Rumoured residence of the, in England, [178] 569
- Postmaster General, The, [178] 895
- Private Business of the Session, [180] 1164
- Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1305, 1306
- Qualification for Offices Abolition, 3R. [178] 182
- Saturday Half-holiday and the Civil Service, [180] 45, 633
- Secretary of State for War, Res. [180] 453
- Slave Trade, The, [179] 877
- Supply, Report, [178] 361;—Civil Service Estimates, 851
- "Times," The, and the Budget, [179] 300
- United States—Proclamation of President Johnson, [179] 564;—The "Alabama" claims, 876, 1107, 1108

Paper Trade
- Motion, "That the position in which the British Paper Trade has been placed by the abolition of the Import Duty on Foreign Paper, leaving the Foreign Export Duty on Rags in full operation, is one of great hardship to the British Manufacturer, and calls for prompt legislative interference, with the view of placing the Home Manufacturer on terms of fair and equitable competition with Continental Manufacturers" (*Mr. Maguire*) *May* 23, [179] 745; after long debate, A. 95, N. 140; M. 45; Question, Mr. Aspinall Turner; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 13, [180] 131

Parliament, Meeting of the
- The Session of Parliament opened by Commission *Feb* 7, [177] 1

Speech of the Lords Commissioners

LORDS—
- Address to Her Majesty on the Lords Commissioners Speech—An humble Address to Her Majesty moved by The Earl of Charlemont (the Motion being seconded by The Lord Houghton) and, after long debate, agreed to *Feb* 7, [177] 7
- Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 10, [177] 128

- *Chairman of Committees*—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 7

[cont.

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Roll of the Lords—Garter King of Arms delivered a List of the Lords Temporal in the Seventh Session of the Eighteenth Parliament of the United Kingdom *Feb* 7
Business of the House, Observations, Lord Redesdale *Mar* 26, [179] 873
Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 7
Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Feb* 7
Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 7
Clerk of the Parliaments, Office of—(see title *Clerk of the Parliaments*)
Dissolution of the Parliament, The, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, Lord Redesdale *June* 27, [180] 850
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, Office of—(see title *Clerk of the Parliaments*)
Printing and Circulation of Reports of Select Committees, Moved, "That in the Case of every Select Committee of this House, other than Select Committees on Private Bills, any Report presented from such Select Committee shall not merely be laid on the table of the House, but shall be printed and circulated; and Notice shall be given on the Minutes of the Day in which it may be intended to take the Report into consideration" (*Earl Stanhope*) *May* 18, [179] 484; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Private Business, Observations, Lord Redesdale *May* 26, [179] 873
Standing Orders—Divisions of the House—Standing Order No. 25—*New Standing Orders*—Standing Order proposed (*The Duke of Richmond*); after short debate, postponed *May* 29, [179] 957; New Standing Orders agreed to *June* 16, [180] 347—*Standing Order No.* 25, Sect. 2. considered and amended (*The Chairman of Committees*) *June* 27, 853—*Standing Order No.* 39 considered and amended *June* 29, 917
Standing Orders, Resolutions Relating to, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; debate thereon *June* 23, [180] 691; Observations, Lord Redesdale; short debate thereon *June* 26, 763; Observations, Lord Redesdale and Earl Granville *July* 3, 1026 — *Resolution of Lord Redesdale relating thereto*, *June* 29, 918

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Wednesday, 12th July *July* 6

COMMONS—

Speech of the Lords Commissioners

THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS' SPEECH reported; Resolution for an humble ADDRESS thereon moved by Sir HEDWORTH WILLIAMSON (the Motion being seconded by Mr. HANBURY TRACY) *Feb* 7, [177] 40; after long debate, Motion agreed to
Report of Address brought up, and read; Address read 2° *Feb* 8, [177] 84
Amendt. In paragraph 11, to leave out the words "and that Ireland during the past year has had its share in the advantages of a good Harvest, with a gradual extension of Trade and Manufacturers," in order to insert the words "we regret that the general condition of Ireland cannot be regarded as prosperous or satisfactory, and that multitudes of the inhabitants continue to emigrate to foreign countries through the want of remunerative employment at home" (*Mr. Scully*); after debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Address;" A. 67, N. 12; M. 55; after further debate, Address agreed to
HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Feb* 10, [177] 155

Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Feb* 7
Controverted Elections, General Committee of Elections (*by Mr. Speaker's Warrant*), List of the Committee *Feb* 9, [177] 127
Printing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 10, [177] 201
Public Petitions—Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 13, [177] 225
Standing Orders—Select Committee on, nominated *Feb* 10, [177] 140
Committee of Selection nominated *Feb* 10, [177] 140
Chairman's Panel reported *Feb* 23, [177] 589
Business of the House, Question, Lord John Manners; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 28, [178] 1204
Forms of the House, Question, Mr. W. O. Stanley; debate thereon *June* 16, [180] 409
New Houses of Parliament—Extension of New Palace Yard, Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 21, [177] 498
Police at Public Buildings, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *June* 13, [180] 131
Police, Houses of Parliament, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 30, [179] 1102
Prorogation of the Parliament, Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 27, [180] 914
Resolutions Relating to Standing Orders considered *June* 30, [180] 981; Observations, Viscount Palmerston *July* 4, 1164

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Wednesday, 12th July *July* 6

LORDS—
The Easter Recess—Ordered *April* 7, "That the House at its rising do adjourn till Thursday, the 27th instant"
The Whitsuntide Recess—Ordered *June* 2, "That the House at its rising do adjourn till Monday, the 12th instant"
See *Private Bills*
Standing Orders
Sat First—Took the Oath
Clerk of the Parliaments—Select Committee

COMMONS—
The Easter Recess—Notice, Viscount Palmerston *April* 7, [178] 894
House at its rising to adjourn till Monday, the 24th of April (*Viscount Palmerston*) *April* 7
Public Business—Question, Lord J. Manners; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 28, [178] 1204

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*
The Whitsuntide Recess, June 2, House at its rising to adjourn till Thursday next
See *New Writs—New Members Sworn*
Private Bills—Standing Orders

Parliamentary Papers—Digest of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient that a digest or abridgment of Parliamentary Papers and Blue Books be provided from time to time, and consolidated into one or more volumes at the close of each Session, &c." (*Mr. William Ewart*), [178] 215; Question, "That the words &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Parochial Medical Relief
Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 31, [178] 568

Parsonages Bill [H.L.]
(*The Archbishop of Canterbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 22 (No. 119)
Read 2ª * *May* 26
Committee * *May* 30 (No. 137)
Report * *June* 1
Read 3ª * *June* 2
c. Read 1° * *June* 12 [Bill 205]
Read 2° * *June* 15
Committee *; Report *June* 16
Considered as amended * *June* 19
Read 3° * *June* 21
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 69]

Partnership Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
177] *c.* Resolution in Committee *Mar* 6, 1202
Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 6 [Bill 52]
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *May* 1, 1273
. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. J. Peel*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, A. 126, N. 39; M. 87; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1273; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2° *May* 1
179] Considered in Committee *May* 18, 526; after long debate, Bill reported
As amended considered * *May* 22 [Bill 156]
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 26
180] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 13, 116; after short debate, Read 2ª *June* 13 (No. 123)
. House in Committee *June* 15, 252
. Amendts. reported *June* 23, 709 (No. 162)
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 86]

Patent Laws
Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 10, [177] 1475; Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 19, [180] 418

Patent Office Accounts, Audit of the
Question, The Earl of Wicklow; Answer, Earl Granville *May* 15, [179] 260; Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 22, 637
See *Edmunds, Leonard, Esq., Resignation of Certain Offices*

Patent Rights—Shepard's, Wright's and Spencer's Patents Bills
Observations, Lord Redesdale *Feb* 24, [177] 635, 736

PATTEN, Colonel J. W. *Lancashire, N.*
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Discharge of Marshall and Whitehead, [179] 1267
Committee of Selection, Report, [180] 259
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 682, 683, 684
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, Amendt. [180] 861, 874, 875
Industrial Schools, Suspension of Standing Order, [178] 487
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, Consid. [178] 887
Private Bills, Referees on, Nomination of Comm. [179] 1051
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 106, 113;—Printing Petitions, 114; Res. 286;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 441, 446
South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 363
Standing Order No. 60, Amendt. [180] 1040
Union Chargeability, [178] 670
Utilization of Sewage and Reclamation of Land (Ireland), Comm. [178] 7
Westminster Improvement Commission, [180] 44

PAULL, Mr. H., *St. Ives*
Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 825
Bankruptcy Laws, [179] 49, 50

Paymaster General and the Audit Office
Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 22, [180] 627

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance (*Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey, Mr. Luke White*)
c. Motion for leave (*Sir Robert Peel*)
Amendt. to adjourn the Debate (*Mr. Hennessy*); Motion agreed to *June* 12, [180] 106
Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [12th June] *June* 15, 319; after short debate, A. 135, N. 43; M. 92; Bill ordered
Presented; read 1° * *June* 16 [Bill 219]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Robert Peel*) *June* 19, 508
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Maguire*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, A. 76, N. 29; M. 47; main Question agreed to; Read 2°
Committee; Report *June* 20, 594
Read 3° * *June* 21

[*cont.*

Peace Preservation Ireland Act Continuance Bill —cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 22
Read 2ª* *June* 27 (No. 200)
Moved, That the House be now put into a Committee on the said Bill (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 29, 921; after short debate, House in Committee
Report * *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 118]

Peacocke, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
Army—Ordnance Experiments, [178] 672;—Ordnance Select Committee, [179] 1223
Canada—Dismissal of Judge Coursol, [177] 137
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 510
Confederate States—Case of Captain Beale, [177] 1536
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 839
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1927, 1928, 1930
Inclosure, Comm. [178] 627, 628
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 818
Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 999, 1003
Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 445
Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. [179] 706, 707, 709, 711
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 327
United States—The Reciprocity Treaty, Papers moved for, [177] 414
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 778

Pease, Mr. H., *Durham Co. S.*
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Railways (Guards and Passengers communication), Res. [179] 70

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Tamworth*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 70, 71; Report, 88, 90
Belfast—Commission of Inquiry at, [177] 119;—Riots at, 347, 353, 354, 355, 356, 360, 367, 368, 369, 371, 385; Res. [180] 145, 148
Casey, Alexander, Property of the late, [178] 371
Clonpriest, &c. Benefices (Ireland), Returns moved for, [177] 244
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 829
Constabulary Force (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1168; 2R. 1513, 1514; Comm. [179] 980, 982, 983; Preamble, 984, 985; *cl.* 1, 986, 987; *cl.* 3, 987, 988; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 988, 989; *cl.* 7, 991; *cl.* 9, 993, 994; *add. cl.* 995, 996; Consid. *add. cl.* [180] 104; *cl.* 3, 105; *cl.* 4, 106
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 265, 266
Courts of Common Law (Ireland), [177] 847
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [179] 480; *cl.* 6, 481, 482; *cl.* 21, 716; Consid. *cl.* 21, 859
Game Licences (Ireland), Leave, [177] 224
[*cont.*

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R.—*cont.*
Ireland — Court of Admiralty, [177] 83;—Arterial Drainage, 84;—Titles to Land, 139; — Constabulary Clothing, 206; — Grand Juries, 207;—State of, Res. 708;—Stipendiary Magistrates — Mr. Ffrench, 1470;—Poor Law Board, 1661;—Administration of the Law, 1740, 1741, 1826, 1828;—The Constabulary and the Game Licences, 1924;—County Down Assizes—Chief Justice Monahan, [178] 197, 198, 201;—Deep Sea Fishery, 670;—Music at the Dublin Exhibition, 1470, 1471;—The Police in Tipperary, [179] 788; —School Reports, 875, 876; — The Constabulary, 1341;—District Lunatic Asylums, [180] 367;—Case of Patrick Donohue, 468; —Dinner to Mr. Gavan Duffy, 1042;—Law Advisers to the Castle, 1043
Lotteries—Public Departments, [179] 1269
Lunatics in Gaols (Ireland), [179] 592
Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1301; 2R. [180] 598
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 106, 321, 324; 2R. 509, 511; Comm. *cl.* 1, 594; *cl.* 4, 595
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. [178] 461, 463, 469
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1248, 1256; —Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1303;—Brehon Laws (Ireland), 1308;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1309, 1310
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R. [178] 755
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1907, 1909; Comm. *cl.* 1, [178] 267

Peel, Right Hon. Lt.-Gen. J., *Huntingdon*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 656; Address moved, 900;—Salary of Dr. Sutherland, [180] 991
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1782;—Disembodied Militia, 1979;—Enrolled Pensioners, 1983;—Manufacturing Departments, 1992; — Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 109; Adj. moved, 852; — Administration of the Army, 959
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 842, 845, 848
Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 992
New Zealand—Troops in, [178] 82
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 593
Private Bills—Printing Petitions, Res. Amendt. [177] 283

Peel, Right Hon. F. (Joint Secretary to the Treasury), *Bury*
Alderney—Breakwater at, [179] 561
Army — Rating of Houses of Officers, [179] 589, 640, 641
British and North American Steam Ship Company, [177] 1368
Civil Service Estimates, [177] 1906; [178] 718, 733, 735, 738; [179] 594
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 717
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries), Res. [180] 527, 528
Court of Chancery (Ireland), [179] 1269
Custom House Charges, [180] 45
Customs, Out Door Officers of, [178] 669
Drainage Act (Ireland), [178] 1317
[*cont.*

Peel, Right Hon. F.—*cont.*
Fulmer Common, Inclosure of, [177] 1117
Government Annuities, [177] 958
Indemnity, Leave, [180] 624, 625 ; 2R. 685
Ireland—Mail Service, [177] 204; [179] 1100 ; —Publication of Irish Records, [177] 288 ;—The River Shannon, 660 ;—The Brehon Laws, 748 ;—Medical Officers in Unions, Res. 1523 ;—Patent and Close Rolls, 1830 ; —Military occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1567, 1568 ;—Poor Fishermen, [179] 915
Isle of Man, Disafforestation (Compensation), Comm. [177] 1457 ; 3R. [178] 1521
Levi, Dr. Leone—"Annals of British Legislation," [179] 392
Navy, Accounts, &c. [177] 502
Office of Works, Comm. moved for, [178] 16
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 219
Piers and Harbours (Scotland), [179] 920
Post Horse Duty, Exemption from, [178] 895
Postmaster General, Office of, Comm. moved for, [178] 382
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 201
Post Office Officials, [178] 561
Probate, Court of, [178] 86
Records, Irish, [180] 368, 460
St. John, Mr., Case of, [179] 788
Salmon Fishery Act Amendment, 3R. [180] 624
Scotland—Postal System of Fife, [178] 370
Secret Service Money, Returns moved for, [180] 591, 592
Shannon River, Nomination of Comm. [179] 555
Supply—Redemption of the Scheldt Toll, [177] 1456 ;—Harbours of Refuge, [179] 595 ;—Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, 595 ;—New Record Buildings, Dublin, 595 ;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 597, 598 ;—Rates for Government Property, 602, 604 ; — Treasury, 606 ; — Home Office, 606 ; — Board of Trade, 611 ; — Controller General of the Exchequer, 702 ;—Works and Public Buildings, 703 ;—Woods, Forests, &c. 704, 706, 710, 711 ; [180] 481, 482 ;— West India Loan Commission, [179] 1136 ; — Superintendent of Roads, South Wales, 1137; — Registration of Friendly Societies, 1138 ; — Secret Service, 1139 ; — Printing and Stationery, 1142, 1145, 1146 ; —Probate Court, 1148 ; — County Courts, 1148 ; — Landed Estates Court, 1150, 1151 ; — Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277 ; — Superannuation Allowances, 1296, 1297, 1298 ;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1303 ; — Fishery Board (Scotland), 1305, 1307, 1308 ;—Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, 1311 ; — Miscellaneous Expenses, 1313 ;—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 473, 477, 478
Treasure Trove, [180] 440
Union Medical Officers (Ireland), [177] 320
West India and Pacific Steam Ship Company's Mail Contract, [177] 1921
West India Postage Rate, [180] 46

Peel, Mr. J., *Tamworth*
Partnership Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [178] 1281 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 532
South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 363

Penalties Law Amendment Bill
(*Sir George Grey, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 202]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Committee * ; Report *June* 14 [Bill 213]
Considered as amended * *June* 15
180] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir George Grey*) *June* 16, 428 ; after short debate, Read 3° *June* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 19
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, 968 ; after short debate, Read 2ª *June* 30 (No. 178)
Considered in Committee * *July* 3 (No. 248)
Amendts. reported ; short debate thereon *July* 4, 1143
Standing Orders Nos. 37 and 38 considered and dispensed with
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*), 1144
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day three months") (*Lord Denman*); Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" Cont. 22, Not-Cont. 14 ; M. 8 ; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1114 ; Read 3ª *July* 4 (No. 254)
Royal Assent *July* 6 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 127]

Pennant, Colonel Hon. E. G. Douglas, *Carmarthenshire*
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 907 ; Res. 1131
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [180] 687 ; *cl.* 1, 845

Percy, Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Mayne, Sir R., and the Barnet Magistrates, [178] 722
Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 27, Amendt. [180] 364
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 370

Perth Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 8 [Bill 61]
Read 2° * *Mar* 13
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 14
Read 3° * *Mar* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 17
Read 2ª * *Mar* 23 (No. 38)
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 24
Read 3ª * *Mar* 27
Royal Assent *April* 7 [28 *Vict.* c. 7]

Peto, Sir S. M., *Finsbury*
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1986, 1987, 2000
Charitable Trusts Fees, 2R. Amendt. [178] 1029
Dockyard Extensions, [179] 1036
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [179] 1325
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, Adj. moved, [177] 1201, 1373 ;—Admiralty Office, [178] 726
Navy — Greenwich Hospital, [177] 1923 ;— Board of Admiralty, [178] 678, 697
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1023
Westminster Improvement Commission, Returns moved for, [179] 210

Pheasants (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 18 (No. 109)
Read 2ª after short debate *May* 22, [179] 630
Committee*; Report *May* 23
Read 3ª* *May* 26
c. Read 1°* *June* 2 [Bill 193]
Read 2°* *June* 14
Committee*; Report *June* 16
Read 3°* *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 54]

Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 23, [177] 589; Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir J. Fergusson*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Read 2°

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Report* *May* 5
Bill ordered* *May* 5
Read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 130]
Read 2°* and referred to Select Committee *May* 11
Report* *May* 29
Committee*; Report *June* 2
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 8
Considered as amended* *June* 12 [Bill 177]
Read 3°* *June* 14 [Bill 195]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 15
Read 2ª* *June* 19 (No. 157)
Committee*; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª* *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 58]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Report* *May* 23
Bill ordered* *May* 23
Read 1°* *May* 25 [Bill 168]
Read 2°* *May* 29
Committed to a Select Committee *June* 2
Report* *June* 15 [Bill 222]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 16
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 19
Read 3°* *June* 20
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 20
Read 2ª* *June* 23 (No. 183)
Report of Select Committee* *June* 29
Committee* *June* 30
Report* *July* 3 (No. 233)
Read 3ª* *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 114]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Report* *June* 13
Bill ordered; read 1°* *June* 13 [Bill 210]
Read 2°* *June* 15
Committee* Report *June* 16
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 19
Read 3°* *June* 20 [Bill 223]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 20
Read 2ª* *June* 23 (No. 184)
[*cont.*

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (*No.* 3) *Bill*—cont.
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3ª* *June* 27
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 114]

Piers and Harbours
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 1, [179] 1121, 1122

Piers and Harbours (*Scotland*)
Question, Mr. R. W. Duff; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 26, [179] 915

Pilotage Order Confirmation Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 17 [Bill 28]
Read 2°* *Feb* 20; committed to a Select Committee
Report* *Mar* 20
Committee*; Report *Mar* 30 [Bill 81]
Read 3°* *April* 7 [Bill 131]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 27 (No. 67)
Read 2ª* *May* 2
Report of Select Committee* *May* 22
Committee* *May* 23; Report* *May* 26
Read 3ª* *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 19 [28 *Vict.* c. 59]

Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Report* *May* 5
Bill ordered* *May* 5, [178] 1572
Read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 96]
Read 2°* *May* 11
Committed to a Select Committee *May* 15, [179] 373
Report* *June* 2 [Bill 194]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 8
Read 3°* *June* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 13
Read 2ª* *June* 19 (No. 154)
Committee*; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª* *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 59]

Plate, The River (see *Brazil and Uruguay*)

Poland
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "whereas the Russian Government shows its determination to set at nought the engagements it contracted in 1815 respecting Poland: Whereas, &c." (*Mr. Hennessy*), [177] 1831; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Police at Public Buildings
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *June* 13, [180] 131

Police—Houses of Parliament
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 30, [17 1102

Police Superannuation Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 7 [Bill 109]
Read 2°* *April* 24
Committee; Report *April* 26, [178] 1071
Considered* *April* 27
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report; as amended considered* *May* 5
Read 3°* *May* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 9
Read 2ª* *May* 18 (No. 95)
Committee* *May* 19
Report* *May* 26
Read 3ª* *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 35]

Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. W., *Westmeath Co.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1797;—Pay and Allowances, 1964
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 455
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 793
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [178] 754
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 222
Spirit Duties (Ireland), Comm. moved for, [178] 1218
Supply — Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [179] 258;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 598
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [177] 1907
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1497

Poor Law
Destitute Poor, Motion for Returns (*Lord Houghton*) agreed to *Feb* 9, [177] 96
Dietary of the Poor in Metropolitan Workhouses, Question, Sir John Shelley; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *May* 15, [178] 299
Green, Mary, Case of, Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 27, [178] 1082
Greenwich Union, Case of Mary Moriarty, Julia Hannan, and Others, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 23, [177] 596
Highworth Union, The, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Viscount Enfield *June* 26, [180] 824
Infectious Patients in Workhouses, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Viscount Enfield *Mar* 13, [177] 1533
Medical Officers of Poor Law Unions, Question, Mr. Richard Long; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 14, [177] 235
Night Refuges (Metropolis), Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 20, [177] 1920
Poor Law Board, Question, Mr. Augustus Smith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Feb* 14, [177] 237
Poor Law Board and the High Wycombe Union, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 23, [178] 82; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, a Copy of a Letter from the Poor Law Board, dated the

[*cont.*

Poor Law—cont.
4th day of March, 1865, and signed by Henry Fleming, secretary, relative to the Wycombe Union" (*Mr. Disraeli*), [179] 216; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Poor Law Secretary, Moved, "That the office of the one Secretary, rendered capable of sitting or voting as a Member of the Commons' House of Parliament by the ninth clause of the Poor Law Act, lately vacated, ought to be abolished" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*) *Feb* 20, [177] 456; after debate, A. 17, N. 193; M. 176
Poor Law Unions—Auditors of Accounts, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 28, [178] 1203
Poor Rates, Metropolitan and Suburban Districts, Petition, Lord Ravensworth *Feb* 16, [177] 278
Poor Relief Metropolis Act (1864), Motion for "Return of the Number of Unions or Parishes that have availed themselves of the Act of 29th July, 1864, &c." (*Lord Houghton*) *Feb* 13, [177] 202; after short debate, Motion agreed to—*Parl. P.* L. (5, 36)
Unions and Gilbert's Unions, Question, Mr. Mitford; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 6, [177] 1115—(see title *Ireland*)
Workhouse Nurses, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *May* 5, [178] 1533
Workhouses, Infectious Patients in, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Viscount Enfield *Mar* 13, [177] 1533
Wycombe Poor Law Union, Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 23, [178] 82

Poor Law Board Continuance, &c., Bill
(*Mr. Villiers, Viscount Enfield*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 2 [Bill 197]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 12, [180] 89
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Packe*), 100; after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," A. 76, N. 69; M. 7; main Question agreed to; Read 2° *June* 12
Committee*; Report *June* 15
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 23, 719
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the provisions of this Bill should be limited to the continuance of the Poor Law Board for one year" (*Lord Fermoy*), 720; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to
Considered in Committee; Report *June* 23
Considered as amended* *June* 26 [Bill 218]
Read 3°* *June* 27 [Bill 238]
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl De Grey*) *June* 27 (No. 227)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 29, 919; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Read 2ª *June* 27
Committee* Report *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 105]

Pope, Rumoured Residence of the, in England
Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 31, [178] 568

PORTMAN, Lord
Imperial Gas, 2R. [179] 863
Metalliferous Mines, 2R. [179] 627

PORTMAN, Hon. W. H. B., *Dorsetshire*
Union Chargeability, Consid. [179] 679

PORTSMOUTH, Earl of
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 31

Post-horse Duty, Exemption from
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Peel *April* 7, [178] 895

Postmaster General Bill
(*Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Barnes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 11 [Bill 144]
Read 2°* *June* 28
Bill withdrawn* *June* 30

Postmaster General, Office of
Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire whether the practice of appointing a Peer of the Realm exclusively to the office of Post Master General is one which is directed or required by any legal enactment or constitutional principle, and whether the continuance of such practice is of advantage to the Public Service" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) *Mar* 28, [178] 378; after debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *April* 7, 895

Postmasters, Remuneration of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is neither just nor expedient that labour and responsibility should be imposed upon public servants, in respect of Post Office Savings Banks, without adequate remuneration" (*Mr. Cave*), [179] 194; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Post Office Officials
Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 31, [178] 560

Post Office — The Three-penny Postage Stamp
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 17, [177] 409

POTTER, Mr. E., *Carlisle*
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 683
Science and Art Department, [177] 500
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 416
Supply — Department of Science and Art, Amendt. [179] 1164, 1165, 1179

POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Cambridge*
Charitable Trusts Fees, 2R. [178] 1032
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 740, 742
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 290
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 892
Exeter, Diocese of, [178] 932, 933
Sewage Utilization, 2R. [177] 1360
Supply — Royal Parks, [179] 243; — New Houses of Parliament, 247, 249; — Public Records Repository, 253; — Patent Office, 255, 256; — Privy Council Office, 608; — Board of Trade, 610
Upper Street, Islington, State of, [179] 241
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. — Fire Insurance, [178] 1508

POWELL, Mr. J. J., *Gloucester*
Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. Preamble, [179] 828
Borough Franchise Extension, Leave, [177] 560
Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Water, 2R. [177] 493
County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 100; *cl.* 12, 102
Foreign Law, Convention of, [180] 1044
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [179] 1007

POWIS, Earl of
Clerical Subscription, Report, [179] 1050
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 662, 749

Princess of Wales
Address of Congratulation to Her Majesty (*Sir George Grey*) *June* 8, [179] 1270
Answer to Address [8th June] reported *June* 14, [180] 250
"I thank you sincerely for your loyal and dutiful Address on the Birth of the Prince My Grandson; and I receive with much satisfaction the renewed assurance of your attachment to my Person and Family"
Moved that an humble Address be presented to the Queen (*The Lord President*) *June* 13, [180] 109; after short debate, Motion agreed to *Nemine Dissentiente*
Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, reported *June* 19, [180] 430
"Your loyal and dutiful Address upon the Birth of the Prince, My Grandson, afforded me much satisfaction; and I thank you for the affectionate interest which you have expressed in the domestic happiness of myself and my Family"

Printing—Select Committee appointed
On Feb 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir John Pakington, Sir Francis Baring, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Sotheron-Estcourt, Mr. Gaskell, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Greene, Mr. Peel, The O'Conor Don, and Mr. Hastings Russell

Prison Libraries
Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 27, [177] 747

Prisons Bill (*Sir George Grey, Mr. Baring*)
177] *c.* Ordered after long debate; Read 1° *Feb* 13, 212 [Bill 15]
Read 2° after debate, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 8, 1361
And, on March 13, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir George Grey (Chairman), Mr. Adderley, Mr. Beach, Mr. Henley, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Hanbury, Lord Edward Howard, Mr. Hunt, Sir William Miles, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Joseph Ewart, Mr. Walter, Mr. Perry-Watlington, and Mr. Whitbread
Report of Select Committee * *May* 11
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *May* 29
179] Committee (*on re-comm.*) *June* 9, 1328
Reported after long debate
Considered as amended * *June* 12
180] Read 3° and passed, after short debate *June* 13, 123 [Bill 141]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 13
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 20, 518; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Read 2ª *June* 20 (No. 155)
Committee *June* 27, 853 (No. 228)
Amendts reported (according to Order); after short debate, further Amendments made *June* 29, 921
Read 3ª * *June* 30 (No. 247)
Royal Assent *July* 6 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 126]

Prisons (Scotland) Act Amendment Bill (*Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24 [Bill 91]
Read 2° * *April* 3
Committee *; Report *May* 11
Read 3° * *May* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 16
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 106)
Committee * *June* 20; Report * *June* 22
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 84]

Private Bill Costs Bill (*Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Crawford*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 7]
177] Read 2° after debate *Feb* 22, and committed to a Select Committee (*Mr. Milner Gibson*)
And, on Feb 24, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Scourfield (Chairman), Mr. Milner Gibson, Lord Hotham, Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Denman, Mr. Pugh, Mr. Caird, and Mr. Arthur Mills; Feb 27, Mr. Watkin added
Report *Mar* 3—(*Parl. P.* No. 104) [Bill 50]
Committee *; Report *Mar* 8
Considered * *Mar* 9
Read 3° * *Mar* 10
Lords Amendts. [Bill 111]
[*cont.*

Private Bill Costs Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Houghton*) *Mar* 13 (No. 31)
Read 2ª after debate *Mar* 23, [178] 75
Considered in Committee *Mar* 27, 273 (No. 47)
Amendts. reported; New clause moved (*Lord Redesdale*); after debate, withdrawn *Mar* 30, 483 (No. 51)
Read 3ª *April* 6, 767
Royal Assent *May* 26 [28 *Vict.* c. 27]

Private Bills
LORDS—
177] *Private Bills*, Orders respecting *Feb* 7, 28
Private Bills—Standing Orders, Committee on, appointed *Feb* 16, 273
Opposed Private Bills, Committee appointed *Feb* 16, 278
178] *Private Bills*—Orders made thereon, *April* 6, 767
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 191—Displacement of London Poor, On Motion of *The Lord Chancellor*, Standing Order No. 191 amended *April* 7, 873
179] *Private Business*, Observations, Lord Redesdale *May* 26, 873; Observations, Lord Stanley
180] of Alderley; Debate thereon *June* 23, 691; Observations, Lord Redesdale; short debate thereon *June* 26, 763; Resolutions relating to Standing Orders considered *June* 30, 981; Observations, Lord Redesdale and Earl Granville *July* 3, 1026
Private Bills, Committees on, On Motion of Earl Cowper, amended by Lord Redesdale, Resolutions, after short debate, agreed to *July* 3, 1033
Ordered, That there be laid upon the Table a list of those Lords who have served on Private Bill Committees during the present Session of Parliament; and the number of times that each Lord has served; and the number of days he sat on every such Committee (*The Earl Cowper*)

Private Bills
COMMONS—
c. Court of Referees, Appointment of, on Private Bills Feb 9, [177] 98
Private Bills, Referees on, Select Committee appointed, and nominated May 30, as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Dodson, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Stanley, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Scholefield, Mr. Woodd, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Ennis, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, and Sir John Shelley
Report *June* 21—(*Parl. P.* No. 393)
Court of Referees, Thanks of Mr. Speaker to the Court of Referees *June* 27, [180] 876
177] *Printing Petitions*, Moved, "That on every Private Bill to be considered by a Committee of this House, all Petitions presented against such Bills be printed at the expense of the Petitioners, and Copies of those Petitions, as well as a Copy of the Bill to be considered, be delivered to each Member of the Committee not less than two days previous to its assembling" (*Mr. Torrens*) *Feb* 9, 113; after debate, Motion withdrawn
[*cont.*

Private Bills—COMMONS—*cont.*

177] *Lords' Minutes of Evidence*, Moved, "That a Message be sent to the Lords requesting their Lordships to communicate to this House the Minutes of Evidence which may be taken before every Committee on a Private Bill originating in the present Session with their Lordships, and sent down to this House" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*) *Feb* 9, 115; after debate, Motion agreed to

. *Select Committees on*, Standing Order No. 7 read; Amendt. to leave out "four" and insert "three" (*Mr. Charles Forster*) *Feb* 9 99; after debate, Question, "That the word 'four' stand part of the said Standing Order;" A. 154, N. 72; M. 82

. *Chairman's Casting Vote—New Standing Order* "Moved, "That all questions before Committees on Private Bills shall be decided by a majority of voices, and whenever the voices are equal, the question shall be resolved in the negative" (*Colonel Wilson Patten*) *Feb* 20, 441; after debate, negatived

. *Opposed Private Bills*, On Motion of *The Chairman of Committees*, resolved, "That all Petitions praying to be heard upon the merits against any Bill in either of the Classes mentioned in Standing Order No. 178, be printed by the Petitioners, and Copies thereof deposited in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, at such time and in such Numbers as the Chairman of Committees may direct" *Feb* 16, 278

. Resolution (*Mr. Torrens*); Amendt. (*General Peel*) *Feb* 16, 282; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Resolutions agreed to

. *Opposed Private Bills*, Resolutions as to Petitioners against Private Bills (*The Chairman of Committees*) *Feb* 27, 743

. *Fees of Parliamentary Counsel*, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 21, 498

. *Standing Orders, Committee on*, *Feb* 10, [177]

180] *Private Bills*—Standing Order No. 179, Sect. 1, considered *June* 24, 761

. *Private Bills*—Standing Orders 184 and 185 considered, and amended *June* 26, 764

. *Private Bills*—Standing Order No. 179, Sect. 1, considered *June* 27, 852; Resolution (*The Chairman of Committees*) agreed to

. *Private Bills*—Standing Order No. 178, Sect. 9, considered and dispensed with for the remainder of the Session (*The Chairman of Committees*) *June* 27, 853

Private Bills—Court of Referees—Standing Order 88 read *June* 27

. Moved, "That the said Standing Order be repealed" (*Colonel Wilson Patten*), 861; Amendt. "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*); Motion

. and original Question withdrawn, 874

Standing Orders 89, 90, 91, and 149 read, and amended

Ordered, That the Standing Orders of this House relating to Private Bills, as amended, be printed *June* 27—(*Parl. P.* No. 420)

. *Private Bills*—Standing Order No. 184, Sect. 2, considered, and amended *June* 29, 917

. *Private Bills*—Standing Orders of the House considered *June* 29, 917

Moved, That the Standing Orders of the House be dispensed with in relation to Private Bills for the Remainder of the Session (*The*

180] *Chairman of Committees*); Motion agreed to *June* 29

. Standing Order No. 60 rescinded, and new Standing Order substituted *July* 3, 1040; Alteration of Standing Orders *July* 4, 1161

Private Business

Observations, Viscount Palmerston *July* 4, [180] 1164

Probate, Court of

Question, Mr. John Locke; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 23, [178] 86

PROBY, Right Hon. Lord (Comptroller of the Household), *Wicklow Co.*

Indian Officers, Her Majesty's Reply to Address, [179] 45

Lords Commissioners' Speech, Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [177] 155

United States — Assassination of President Lincoln, Answer to Address, [178] 1471

Procurators (Scotland) Bill

(*Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)

c. Ordered * *Mar* 21

Read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 87]

Read 2° * *Mar* 31

Committee *; Report *May* 18 [Bill 157]

Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 25

Read 3° * *June* 12

Lords Amendts. [Bill 248]

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 13

Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 153)

Committee * *June* 20; Report * *June* 22

Read 3ª * *June* 23 (No. 207)

Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 85]

Protection of Female Children Bill

(*The Lord Denman*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 6 (No. 255)

Public Accounts, Committee of

Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 17, [177] 320

On Feb 20, Select Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie (Chairman), Mr. Walpole, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Peel, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Howes, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Pollard-Urquhart; April 3, Mr. Stansfeld added

Report of the Committee—(*Parl. P.* No. 413)

Public House Closing Act (1864) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Cox, Mr. Goschen*)

177] *c.* Ordered after debate *Feb* 14, 251

Read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 22]

178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Cox*) *April* 6, 863

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Lawson*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Read 2° *April* 6

[*cont.*

Public House Closing Act (1864) *Amendment Bill*—cont.
179] Considered in Committee *May* 18, 542 ; after long debate, Bill reported [Bill 159]
Considered * *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
Lords Amendts. [Bill 239]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *May* 26 (No. 126)
Read 2ª after short debate *June* 1, 1116
180] Moved, That the House be now put into Committee on the said Bill *June* 13, 112 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; House in Committee, 114 (No. 151)
Amendt. reported *June* 20, 515
Moved, to re-insert Clause 5 (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Clause re-inserted (No. 192)
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 77]

Public House Closing Act (1864) *Amendment Bill*
Question, Mr. Cox ; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 30, [178] 488

Public Museums, &c.
Petitions for opening in Evenings presented (*Lord Ebury*) *June* 30, [180] 969

Public Offices (Site and Approaches) Bill
(*Mr. Cowper, Sir Charles Wood*)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Cowper*), [177] 1301 ; after debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Packe*) ; Motion withdrawn ; main Question agreed to
Bill ordered ; read 1° * and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills *Mar* 7 [Bill 55]
Read 2° * and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 20
And, on March 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cowper (Chairman), Lord John Manners, Sir John Shelley, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. H. B. Baring, Mr. E. P. Bouverie, and Mr. Gaskell
Report * *April* 3 [Bill 99]
Committee * ; Report *April* 6
Read 3° * *April* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *April* 27
Read 2ª after debate *May* 19, [179] 559 (No. 68)
Committee * ; Report *May* 22
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *May* 23
Read 3ª * *May* 26
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 31]

Public Petitions
On Feb 13, Committee appointed as follows :— Mr. Charles Forster (Chairman), Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Gard, Major Gavin, Lieut.-Col. Gray, Sir Edward Grogan, Mr. Hope Johnstone, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Taverner John Miller, Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Owen Stanley, and Viscount Enfield

Public Schools Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Clarendon*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 13 (No. 32)
178] Petitions from University of Oxford and Mercers Company, presented (*The Earl of Derby*), 630
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Clarendon*) *April* 3, 632 ; after long debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2ª *April* 3
Petitions presented (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *April* 4, 744
Bill referred to a Select Committee *May* 2, 1304
And, on May 4, Committee nominated as follows :—His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, Ld. President, D. Marlborough, E. Derby, E. Devon, E. Stanhope, E. Clarendon, E. Carnarvon, E. Powis, E. Harrowby, V. Stratford de Redcliffe, V. Eversley, L. Bp. London, L. Lyttelton, L. Houghton ; May 5, Lord Wrottesley added
Report of Select Committee * *June* 22 (No. 90)
Bill as amended (No. 202)

PUGH, Mr. D., *Carmarthenshire*
Malt Duty, Comm. [180] 270, 275
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 566
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 316 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 502

Qualification for Offices Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Hadfield, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Baines*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 2]
177] Read 2° after debate, and committed to a Select Committee *Feb* 13, 212
And, on March 1, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Hadfield (Chairman, Mr. Peel, Mr. Locke King, Sir John Trelawny, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Bright, Mr. Remington Mills, Mr. Baines, Lord Robert Montagu, Sir Brook Bridges, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. R. Long, and Mr. F. S. Powell
Report *Mar* 9 [Bill 62]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *Mar* 16
Considered as amended * *Mar* 17
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Hadfield*) *Mar* 23, 181
Debate arising on a point of order ; Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel Dunne*) ; A. 72, N. 141 ; M. 69 ; Question again proposed ; after further debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Newdegate*), 186 ; after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 130, N. 56 ; M. 74
Bill read 3° *Mar* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Houghton*) *Mar* 24 (No. 46)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Lord Houghton*) *May* 1, 1228
Amendt. to leave out "now," and insert "this day six months" (*The Earl of Derby*). Question, "That 'now,' &c., Cont." 49, Not-Cont. 72 ; M. 23 ; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1236
Bill to be read 2ª on this day six months

Railway Accidents
Question, Mr. Bentinck ; Answer, Mr. Milner

[*cont.*

Railway Accidents—cont.
Gibson *Feb* 9, [177] 116; Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 6, "That it is, in the opinion of this House, desirable that power should be vested by Act of Parliament in the Board of Trade, or in some other Department of the Government, to institute an inquiry into the causes of any accidents which may occur on Railways, with powers to call for all papers and to examine witnesses on oath; and that, &c." (*Mr. Bentinck*), [177] 1124; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, agreed to
Accident on the Great Western Railway, Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 9, [179] 1337; Observations, Sir Lawrence Palk; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 9, 1342
Sweter, Thomas, and others, Moved, "That there be laid before this House Copy of any Papers relating to the inquest on the bodies of Thomas Sweter, George Kent, and William Anderton" (*Sir Lawrence Palk*) *July* 4, [180] 1165; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Railway Bills—(*Group* 8)
Moved, "That the Special Report from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders, &c." (*Mr. Thompson*) *May* 26, [179] 874; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 37]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Whalley*) *June* 20, [180] 593; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Railway Debentures, &c. Registry Bill
[H.L.] (*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 11 (No. 99)
Read 2ª * *June* 12
Considered in Committee * *June* 20
Report * *June* 22 (No. 191)
Read 3ª * *June* 23
c. Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 241]
Order for second reading read *June* 26, [180] 848; after short debate, second reading put off for a fortnight

Railway Passengers Bill
(*The Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Observations, The Earl of Dartmouth; Reply, Lord St. Leonards *June* 13, [180] 107; short debate thereon
Bill presented; after short debate read 1ª *June* 13, [180] 107; Bill withdrawn *June* 19, 432 (No. 149)

Railway Travelling (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Colonel Dickson, Major Gavin, Mr. Stacpoole*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 10 [Bill 66]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*) *Mar* 22, [178] 51
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Blake*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 39, N. 42; M. 3; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; second reading put off for six months

Railways
Communication between Passengers and Guards, Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 16, [177] 1741; Moved, "That some immediate provision should be made for compelling Railway Companies to make arrangements for establishing a proper communication between Guards and Passengers" (*Sir William Gallwey*) *May* 9, [179] 60; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Legislation, Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, [177] 231; Question, Mr. Scully; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, 235
Travelling, Question, Colonel Greville; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 15, [180] 262

Railways Clauses Bill
(*Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Hutt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 25 [Bill 114]
Read 2° * *May* 25
Committee *; Report *May* 26 [Bill 170]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 21, [180] 616
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Bass*), 618; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Rating of Mines and Timber
Question, Mr. Lyall; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Feb* 24, [177] 659

Rating of Official Residences
Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 19, [179] 587; Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 22, 640

RAVENSWORTH, Lord
Imperial Gas, 2R. Amendt. [179] 862
Imperial Gas Company's Works at Chelsea, [179] 112
Johnson, Colonel, Case of, [178] 1532
Poor Rates, Metropolitan and Suburban Districts, [177] 278, 280
Sewage Utilization, 2R. [179] 374; Comm. 628, 629
Sheep and Cattle, 2R. [178] 1458
Tyne Improvement, 3R. [180] 850
United States — Assassination of President Lincoln, [178] 1451

Reading Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees
The Hon. Slingsby Bethell appointed *Feb* 17, [177] 316

Record of Title (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 6 (No. 63)
178] Read 2ª after short debate *May* 4, 1453
Committee*; Report *May* 9 (No. 97)
Read 3ª* *May* 12
Commons Amendts. (No. 194)
c. Read 1º* *May* 17 [Bill 151]
179] Read 2º after long debate *May* 25, 841; Bill considered in Committee after debate; Committee—R.P. *June* 1, 1181
180] Considered in Committee; Committee—R.P. *June* 12, 86
Committee; Report *June* 15, 330 [Bill 217]
Considered as amended* *June* 19
Read 3º* *June* 20
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 88]

Record of Title (Ireland) [*Stamps*]
c. Resolution in Committee* *June* 13
Resolution reported *June* 14

REDESDALE, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland), 2R. [177] 1222
Business of the House, [180] 918
Business, Private, [179] 873
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 692, 694, 763, 764, 1026
Clerical Subscription, Report, [179] 1046
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1036
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [180] 347
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [178] 1192; Comm. Amendt. 1308; [180] 252
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [178] 1584; *add. cl.* 1585, 1587, 1588; Commons Amendts. [180] 358
Courts of Justice, The New, Returns moved for, [177] 1918
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 552
Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 958
Edmunds, Leonard—Resignation of, Comm. moved for, [177] 1215, 1220, 1221; Report of Select Comm. Res. [178] 1573;—Pension, Res. 6, [179] 38, 42, 44
Education, National, [177] 1735
Education — Revised Code — Examination of Children, [178] 879
Imperial Gas, 2R. [179] 866
Local Government Supplemental (No. 4), 2R. [180] 255
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257
Marriages (Lambourne), Comm. [179] 192
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 3R. [179] 1115
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [179] 719
Opposed Private Bills, Res. [177] 278
Parliament, Dissolution of the, [180] 851
Patent Rights, [177] 635, 636, 736
Penalties Law Amendment, 2R. [180] 968
Report, *cl.* 4, 1144
[*cont.*

REDESDALE, Lord—*cont.*
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [178] 76; Report; *add. cl.* 483, 484
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 179, [180] 852, 917
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [179] 1117; Comm. [180] 113, 114
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), 2R. [179] 559
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [177] 735
Sewage Utilization, 2R. [179] 377; Comm. 629
Standing Order No. 191 — Displacement of London Poor, [178] 875
Transportation to Australia, [177] 741
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 38

Reformatory Children, Exhibition of
Question, Mr. Taverner John Miller; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 25, [178] 1001

Refreshment Houses Act, Convictions under
Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 20, [177] 450; Question, Sir Charles Douglas; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 27, 749

Regent's Park—Bridge over the Canal
Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 23, [177] 600

Rentcharges (Ireland) Revision Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 22 (No. 203)

Revision of the Liturgy
Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 1, [179] 1122

RICHMOND, Duke of
Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 957, 959; [180] 347
Union Chargeability, 3R. [180] 525

RIDLEY, Sir M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
North and South Shields, Ports of, [180] 1162
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 721
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 122

River Waters Protection Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 9 [Bill 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" (*Lord R. Montagu*) *Mar* 8, [177] 1309
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Jackson*), 1335; after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Rivers, Pollution of
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 30, [179] 1101

Roach River Fishery Bill
l. Read 2ª after short debate *Feb* 27, [177] 734
c. Read 2º after debate *June* 8, [179] 1262, and committed

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill
(*Lord Elcho, Sir G. Montgomery, Sir R. Anstruther*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *April* 3 [Bill 101]
Read 2º* *April* 25
Committee*; Report *May* 25 [Bill 165]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 19—R.P.
Report *June* 20, [180] 534 [Bill 231]

ROBERTSON, Mr. D., *Berwickshire*
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1064

ROBERTSON, Mr. H., *Shrewsbury*
Navy—Board of Admiralty, [178] 689
Navy Estimates—New Works, &c. [179] 938, 942
Private Bills—Chairman's Casting Vote, [177] 442
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 66

Rochdale Vicarage Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Chichester*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 23 (No. 213)
Read 2ª* *June* 26
Committee*; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª* *June* 29
c. Read 1º* *June* 29 [Bill 252]
Read 2º* *June* 30
Committee*; Report *July* 3
Read 3º* *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 117]

ROEBUCK, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
Azeem Jah, (Signatures to Petitions), Report, Res. [178] 1606, 1609
Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 822; Preamble, 827, 828
Bankruptcy Act, Select Comm. moved for, [177] 123
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1393, 1449
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1627
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 476
Felony and Misdemeanor Evidence and Practice, 2R. [177] 578
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1197
Hutt, Major General, Case of, [177] 1537
Inns of Court, 2R. [178] 1045
Ionian Islands—Pensions to Officers, [178] 376, 377, 378
Ireland—State of, Res. [177] 751;—Case of Patrick Doyle, 1481
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 613, 617
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 310, 313, 314
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 779
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 649
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1485
[*cont.*

ROEBUCK, Mr. J. A.—*cont.*
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 538
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 325
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 568
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 868; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 545, 547, 551, 552
Railway Legislation, [177] 231, 233
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 62
Saffron Hill Murder, [178] 84
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 778

ROGERS, Mr. J. J., *Helston*
Army—Military Train, [179] 641

Roll of the Lords
Delivered *Feb* 7

ROLT, Mr. J., *Gloucestershire, W.*
Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 839
Courts of Justice Building, Comm. *cl.* 3, [177] 606; *add. cl.* 607
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 2R. [177] 607

Roman Catholic Bishops
Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 29, [180] 927

Roman Catholic Oath Bill
(*Lord J. Browne, Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Hennessy*)
178] *c.* Act considered in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1º *Mar* 21, 24 [Bill 86]
179] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" (*Mr. Monsell*) *May* 17, 429
. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Lefroy*), 438; after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 190, N. 134; M. 56; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 477; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2º *May* 17
Order for Committee read
. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Monsell*) *May* 19, 611; Motion, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Vance*); A. 44, N. 115; M. 71
. Question again proposed, 617; Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Banks Stanhope*); A. 36, N. 102; M. 66
. Question again proposed, 619; after further debate, debate adjourned
Adjourned debate on going into Committee [19th May] further adjourned *May* 23
. Question again proposed; Debate [19th May] resumed *May* 30, 1051; Amendt. to leave out "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Newdegate*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, A. 193, N. 126; M. 67; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee *May* 30, 1097; Committee—R.P.; Division List, Ayes and Noes
180] Committee; Report *June* 12, 46
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3º" (*Mr. Monsell*) *June* 15, 325; after short debate, Question agreed to; Read 3º *June* 15
[*cont.*

Roman Catholic Oath Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 16 (No. 170)
80] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 26, 764
Amendt. to leave out "now," and insert "this day three months" (*The Earl of Derby*), 772; after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," Cont. 63, Not-Cont. 84; M. 21; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 821; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this day three months

Roman Catholic Oath Bill
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir George Grey; Observations thereon *May* 23, [179] 741; Observations, Sir John Pakington; Reply, Mr. Monsell *May* 29, 1035

Roman Catholic Schools
Question, The Marquess of Westmeath; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 27, [180] 859

Rome—British Passports
Question, Mr. H. Baring; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 20, [177] 450

Rose, Mr. Alderman W. A., *Southampton*
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 828
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 95
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 504, 506
Customs, Out Door Officers of, Comm. moved for, [178] 1208
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 838, 848
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 605
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 844
Metropolitan Police Rate, [177] 1903
Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the, [179] 212
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1297
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 472; —Office of Woods, &c. 481, 482
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [178] 1016
Wimbledon Common, 2R. [178] 779

Rupert's Land
Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 3, [178] 1601

Russell, Earl (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [178] 1078; Papers moved for, [179] 735, 1043, 1044; [180] 110, 112, 1151, 1155
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 33
Belligerent Rights, [179] 287, 291
Brazil and Uruguay—The River Plate, [177] 1367
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 696
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 434

Russell, Earl—*cont.*
Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 192
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 31, 37
Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 700
Jackson, Mr., Claims of, [180] 975
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 792, 800
Ryan, Mary, Case of, [177] 1649
Sarawak—Consul at, [180] 690
Slave Trade, The, [180] 431
Turkey and Persia—Boundary Negotiations, Papers moved for, [177] 1731
United States—Relations with the, [178] 68;—Assassination of President Lincoln, 1073, 1074; Address moved, 1219; Belligerent Rights, [180] 4, 6;—Close of the Civil War, 1143

Russell, Sir W., *Norwich*
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 832, 845; Consid. [178] 887 *add. cl.* 1000

Russia Companies Dues — The Consul General at St. Petersburgh
Question, Mr. Clay; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 14, [177] 234; Question, Mr. Clay; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 14, 234

Russia, Epidemic in
Question, The Bishop of Oxford; Answer, Earl Granville *April* 4, [178] 744; Question, Sir John Pakington; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 6, 784; Question, The Bishop of Oxford; Answer, Earl Granville *April* 7, 879; Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Sir George Grey *April* 7, 889

Rutland, Duke of
Union Chargeability, 2R. Amendt. [180] 20

Saffron Hill Murder—Case of Pelizzioni
Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Sir George Grey *Feb* 13, [177] 209; Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 84; Question, Lord Houghton; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 30, 484

St. Benet, Gracechurch Street, and Allhallows, Lombard Street
Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. E. P. Bouverie *Feb* 17, [177] 321

St. George's-in-the-East—Rev. Bryan King
Explanation, Mr. Staniland *May* 29, [179] 977

St. Germans, Earl of (Lord Steward of the Household)
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [177] 1222, 1223; Comm. 1645; Report, [178] 274; Commons Amendts. 1305
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), 2R. [179] 1044
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 923
Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation, 2R. [179] 3, 4

St. James's Park
Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 9, [179] 1347

St. John, Case of Mr.
Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 25, [179] 788

St. Leonards, Lord
Attorneys and Solicitors, 2R. [177] 1463
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Commons Amendts. [178] 1306
Cartoons at Hampton Court Palace, [178] 556, 558
Clerical Subscription, Report, [179] 1049
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [177] 1030; 3R. [179] 106
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [178] 1181; Comm. 1309; *cl.* 16, 1314; 3R. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1578, 1580, 1581, 1582
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 553, 554, 555
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. [180] 522
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [179] 721
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [180] 117; Comm. *cl.* 1, 252; Report, 712
Patent Office—Appointment of Mr. Edmunds, Explanation, [179] 717
Railway Passengers, 1R. [180] 108, 434, 436
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [178] 1456
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 807
Strikes and Lock Outs, 1R. [178] 1575

St. Maur, Earl
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 31

St. Titus Church, Liverpool
Petition presented by The Earl of Derby; Observations thereon *May* 26, [179] 860

Salisbury, Marquess of
Public Schools, [178] 744

Salmon Fishery Act (1861) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Baring, Sir George Grey*)
178] Ordered *April* 25, 1024
Read 1° * *April* 26 [Bill 117]
179] Read 2° and committed to a Select Committee *May* 15, 373
And, on May 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. T. Baring (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Mr. C. Bentinck, Mr. H. Fenwick, Mr. E. Fenwick, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Knight, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Lygon, Lord R. Montagu, Mr. Morritt, Colonel Pennant, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. McMahon, Mr. Mackie
Report * *June* 1 [Bill 187]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 12
180] Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 16, 363 [Bill 220]
As amended considered *June* 20, 592; after short debate, Read 3° *June* 21, 624
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 22
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 199)
Considered in Committee *June* 27, 857
Report * *June* 29 (No. 229)
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 121]

Salmon Fishery Acts
Question, Mr. Knight; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *April* 7, [178] 888

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*)
l. Read 1ª * *June* 19 (No. 175)

Salomons, Mr. Alderman D., *Greenwich*
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic (Signatures to Petitions), Report, [177] 1737; Comm. [179] 59
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1255; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1265; *cl.* 8, 1266; *add. cl.* 1269, 1272; 3R. [179] 310; Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, 826
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 717
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 840
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 130
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, Leave, [177] 949; 2R. [178] 1053
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [178] 731;—Wages to Artificers at Home, 948;—New Works, &c. [179] 939, 940
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 531
Supply—New Houses of Parliament, [179] 250;—New Westminster Bridge, 253;—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 258;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 599;—Rates for Government Property, 601
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 846

Salt, Mr. T., *Stafford*
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. *cl.* 8, [178] 1268
Government Annuities, [177] 959

Sarawak, The Consul at
Question, Viscount Stratford De Redcliffe; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 23, [180] 690

Sat First
Feb 7—The Earl Cadogan, after the Death of his Father
Feb 24—The Lord Oxenford, after the Death of his Father
Mar 2—The Duke of Cleveland after the Death of his Brother
May 29—The Earl Poulett, after the Death of his Uncle
June 16—The Lord Ashburton, after the Death of his Brother
June 27—The Earl of Morley, after the Death of his Father

Saturday Half-Holiday and the Civil Service
Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 12, [180] 45; Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *June* 22, 633

Savings Banks and the National Debt
Question, Mr. Henley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 19, [180] 442

Schleswig and Holstein, Duchies of
Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 27, [177] 749; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Layard *April* 7, [178] 925

SCHNEIDER, Mr. H. W., *Lancaster*
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 341

SCHOLEFIELD, Mr. W., *Birmingham*
India—Lucknow Prize Money, [178] 371
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1285

Science and Art Collections
Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 21, [177] 500; Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, Mr. Cowper; debate thereon *May* 5 [178] 1537

SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. G., *Hampshire, N.*
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1145
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 112;—Chairman's Casting Vote, 445
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 341

SCOTLAND
Collection of the Revenue in, Observations, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 12, [179] 223
Drainage and Improvement of Landed Property, Observations, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Reply, Sir George Grey *June* 1, [179] 1124
Farm Buildings and Cottages in, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 30, [180] 982
Judicial Statistics, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 2, [177] 958
Lands and Heritages, Valuation of, Select Committee appointed (*Mr. Dunlop*) *Feb* 24, [177] 733
And, on March 8, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Dunlop (Chairman), Mr. Baxter, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Lord George Cavendish, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Major Cumming Bruce, Mr. Dalglish, Colonel Douglas Pennant, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. William Leslie, Mr. Mackie, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Smollett; Mar 21, Sir Edward Colebrooke disch., Sir John Ogilvy added; May 3, Mr. Adam added
Report of Select Committee *May* 22—(*Parl. P.* No. 300)
Medical Practitioners, Question, Mr. Black; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 23, [177] 599
Piers and Harbours, Question, Mr. R. W. Duff; Answer, Mr. Peel *May* 26, [179] 915
Port Patrick Harbour, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *April* 6, [178] 783
Postal System of Fife, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 28, [178] 370

SCOTLAND—*cont.*
Roads and Bridges Bill, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Lord Elcho *Mar* 20, [177] 1922; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord Elcho *May* 15, [179] 302—See *Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill*
Sheriff's Court, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 3, [177] 1042

SCOTT, Lord H. J., *Selkirkshire*
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1194

SCOURFIELD, Mr. J. H., *Haverfordwest*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 67
Bath, Order of the, Address moved, [180] 406
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 90
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 923
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 390
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1431
Postmasters, Remuneration of, Res. [179] 200
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 564, 575
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 111
South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 363
Supply— Superintendent of Roads, South Wales, [179] 1137;—Post Office Department, 1360
Turnpike Tolls Abolition, Leave, [178] 1524
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 314; Comm. [179] 121; Consid. 687

SCULLY, Mr. V., *Cork Co.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 53; Report, Amendt. 84, 89
Army — Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 532
Clonpriest, &c. Benefices (Ireland), Returns moved for, [177] 239, 250
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 836
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 523; [179] 1269
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 196
Criminal Cases (Evidence), 2R. deferred, [177] 945
Flogging in Gaols, [178] 77
Inland Revenue, Comm. Preamble, [180] 307
Ireland—Titles to Land, [177] 139;—Mail Service; 204;—Stipendiary Magistrates—Mr. Ffrench, 1476;—Case of Mary Ryan, 1535;—Administration of Justice, 1828, 1829;—Railway System, Address moved, [178] 912
Land Debentures (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [178] 752; *cl.* 11, 754, 755
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, Amendt. [178] 623, 625
Law of Evidence, &c. Leave, [177] 261; 2R. 940
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, [180] 911
Metropolis—Park Lane, [178] 889
Monastic and Conventual Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1084
Mortgage Debentures, 2R. [177] 272
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 320; Comm. *cl.* 1, 594; *cl.* 4, 595

[cont.

SCULLY, Mr. V.—*cont.*
Post Office Officials, [178] 560
Railways, [177] 235
Record of Title (Ireland), Comm. [179] 1181; *cl.* 10, [180] 87; *cl.* 14, 88; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 330
Records, Irish, Publication of, Res. [180] 459
Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [178] 465
Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1144;—County Courts, 1148, 1149;—Landed Estates Court, 1150, 1151;—Constabulary (Ireland), 1151;—Department of Science and Art, 1175;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1305;—Fishery Board (Scotland), 1307;—Flax Cultivation (Ireland), 1309;—Miscellaneous Expenses, 1313
Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [180] 240, 241
Titles to Land Registration (Ireland), [177] 747
Tobacco, Home-grown, [180] 925
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), 2R. [178] 757
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 315

Sea Fisheries
Question, Mr. McMahon; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 27, [177] 748

Secret Service Money
Motion for a "Return" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) *June* 20, [180] 590; after short debate, A. 18, N. 45; M. 27

Secretary of State for War, The
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it would be convenient, under present circumstances, that the Secretary of State for War should be a Member of the House of Commons" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*), [180] 450; Question, "That the words &c;" after short debate, agreed to

SEELY, Mr. C., *Lincoln*
Navy — Dockyard Accounts, [177] 1010;—Board of Admiralty, [178] 704;—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 369, 382, 396
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1196, 1455;—Wages of Artificers at Home, Amendt. [178] 951, 953

Select Committees
Notice of Nomination, Resolution (*Earl Stanhope*) *May* 5, [178] 1531
Reports of — Printing and Circulation of, Moved, "That in the Case of every Select Committee of this House, other than Select Committees on Private Bills, any Report presented from such Select Committee shall not merely be laid on the table of the House, but shall be printed and circulated; and Notice shall be given on the Minutes of the Day in which it may be intended to take the Report into consideration" (*Earl Stanhope*) *May* 18, [179] 484; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Select Vestries [H.L.]
l. Bill, *pro formâ,* read 1^{a}* *Feb* 7

Selection, Committee of
On Feb 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Lord Hotham, and Mr. Mowbray

SELWYN, Mr. C. J., *Cambridge University*
Charitable Trusts Fees, 2R. [178] 1030
Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [180] 841
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 179
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 178; Lords Amendts. [179] 1185
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [180] 318
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 532
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1337
Supply—Education, [179] 1160

Sewage of the Metropolis
Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Tite *Mar* 10, [177] 1479

Sewage Utilization Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Ordered; read 1^{o}* *Feb* 9 [Bill 4]
Read 2^{o}, after short debate, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 8, [177] 1360
And, on March 13, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Mr. Cowper, The Lord Advocate, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Crum-Ewing, Mr. Hibbert, Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Longfield, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Gore Langton, and Mr. Leader
Report of Select Committee *April* 6 [Bill 105]
Committee*; Report *April* 27
Considered* *May* 1
Read 3^{o}* *May* 2
Lords Amendts. [Bill 221]
l. Read 1^{a}* (*Lord Ravensworth*) *May* 4 (No. 80)
Read 2^{a} after debate *May* 16, [179] 374
Bill referred to a Select Committee *May* 22, 628
And, on May 26, Committee nominated as follows:— E. Derby, E. Romney, V. Strathallan, V. Torrington, V. Eversley, L. Polwarth, L. Boyle, L. Redesdale, L. Portman, L. Ebury; May 29, E. of Essex added
Report of Select Committee *May* 30 (No. 139)
As amended (No. 134)
Committee* *June* 1; Report* *June* 2
Read 3^{a}* *June* 13
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 75]

SEYMOUR, Mr. H. D., *Poole*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects in, [180] 1002, 1014
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 60
Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [177] 1972, 1973;—Divine Service, 1974;—Yeomanry, 1980, 1983;—Enrolled Pensioners, 1984;—Manufacturing Departments, 1990, 1998, 1999
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Comm. moved for, [177] 1706; Report, [179] 1247
[*cont.*

Seymour, Mr. H D.—*cont.*
British Museum, Enlargement of the, [179] 390, 391, 489
Cape of Good Hope—Long *v.* Bishop of Cape Town, [179] 487
Colonial Bishops, [178] 783
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 180, 495
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 944
Ecclesiastical Commission, [180] 1044
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 913
Government of India Act, [179] 587
India—Bombay Back Bay Shares, [177] 1950;—Labour Ordinance, [178] 236, 240;—The Budget, 891;—Expedition to Bhootan, 936, 941;—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 406
Lahore Bishopric, [180] 447
Patent Office, Alleged irregularities in the, [177] 1122
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 105;—Minutes of Evidence (Lords), 115
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1563
South Kensington New Road, Re-Comm. [180] 360, 363
State Papers, [178] 789
Supply—Lighthouses Abroad, [179] 596;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 598;—Registrars of Friendly Societies, 1137;—Printing and Stationery, 1140, 1143;—Department of Science and Art, 1173;—National Gallery, Adj. moved, 1260;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1285, 1286, 1287, 1291, 1292;—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 476, 478;—National Gallery Enlargement, 493

Seymour, Mr. W. D., *Southampton*
Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants on the, [179] 211

Shaftesbury, Earl of
Agricultural Gangs, Address moved, [179] 174
Burial Service, The, [180] 708
Church in Ireland—The 29th Canon of 1603, [180] 1160
Clerical Subscription, 3R. [179] 1118
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [180] 347
Courts of Justice Site, [177] 416
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, Standing Order No. 191, Amendt. [178] 543, 555
Dockrall, Mr., Case of, Papers moved for, [178] 191
Episcopate, Increase of the, [180] 701
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, 2R. [179] 193; Comm. 382
North West Territory—British North America, [177] 588
St. Titus Church, Liverpool, [179] 862

Shannon River
Select Committee appointed April 27
Moved, "That Colonel French be one of the Members of the Select Committee" *May* 18, [179] 555
Amendt. "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Crawford*); A. 34, N. 17; M. 17; Debate adjourned
Adjourned debate, on Question [18th May],
[*cont.*

Shannon River—cont.
"That Colonel French be one of the Members of the Select Committee on Shannon River" resumed *May* 22, 716; Question put, and agreed to
Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel French (Chairman), Mr. Laird, Mr. Peel, Mr. Ormsby Gore, Lord Dunkellin, Mr. Agar-Ellis, Sir E. Dering, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. D. Fortescue, and Colonel Vandeleur; May 23, Sir W. Jolliffe, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Cave, Mr. Acland, Mr. Hennessy added
Report of the Committee *June* 23—(*Parl. P.* No. 400)

Shannon River (*Navigation and Drainage*)
l. On Motion (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) Select Committee appointed *May* 22, [179] 628
And, on May 23, Committee nominated as follows:—D. Richmond, Ld. Steward, E. Spencer, E. Cadogan, E. Belmore, E. Grey, V. Clancarty, L. Ponsonby, L. Crofton, L. Granard, L. Somerhill, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Lyveden; May 26, The Marquess of Lansdowne added
Report of Committee *May* 29 (*Parl. P.* 130)
Report *June* 26—(*Parl. P.* No. 210)

Sheep and Cattle Bill
(*Mr. H. Fenwick, Mr. Shafto, Sir H. Williamson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 7 [Bill 57]
Read 2° after debate *Mar* 29, [178] 469
Committee*; Report *Mar* 30
Read 3°* *Mar* 31
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Ravensworth*) *April* 3
Read 2ª after debate *May* 4, 1458 (No. 58)
Committee* *May* 9; Report* *May* 11
Read 3ª* *May* 12
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 60]

Sheep, &c. Protection (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir F. Heygate, Mr. Leader, The O'Conor Don*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 24 [Bill 43]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir F. Heygate*) *Mar* 29, [178] 457
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Scully*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question agreed to; Read 2° *Mar* 29

Sheerness Dockyard
Question, Sir Edward Dering; Answer, Lord Clarence Paget *June* 19, [180] 469

Shelley, Sir J. V., *Westminster*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 660
Azeem Jah—Nawab of the Carnatic—Forged Signatures, Report, [177] 1738
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, Leave, [177] 1725; 2R. [178] 1301, 1302, 1303
Chemists and Druggists (No. 1), 2R. [178] 473
Chemists and Druggists (No. 2), Leave, [178] 46
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 736
County Voters Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 102
Court of Referees on Private Bills—Standing Order 88, [180] 875
[*cont.*

Shelley, Sir J. V.—*cont.*
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Comm. [178] 180, 492
Drake, Mr., Case of the late, [178] 487
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), Consid. *cl.* 18, [180] 718
Inclosure, 2R. [178] 541
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [178] 1064; *cl.* 1, 1071
Metropolitan Toll Bridges, 2R. [178] 1059
Metropolitan Workhouses, Dietary of, [179] 299
New Palace Yard, Extension of, [177] 498
Parochial Medical Relief, [178] 568
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 100; Comm. 721
Public House Closing Act Amendment, 2R. [178] 868; Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 554
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1302
Supply—Secret Service, [179] 1140;—Probate Court, 1147, 1148
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 689
Union of Benefices Act Amendment, Leave, [177] 1460
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Tea, [178] 1495

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1139
Fire Insurance, Res. [178] 35, 44
Morocco—The Jews in, [178] 1083
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, [178] 1505, 1511

Shrewsbury, Earl of
Navy — Captains on the Reserved List, [180] 977

Sidney, Mr. Alderman T., *Stafford*
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 123; *cl.* 2, 500; Consid. 666

Silver Coinage, The
Question, Mr. J. C. Ewart; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 15, [180] 261

Simony, Law of,
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 30, [180] 982

Singapore and the Straits Settlements
Question, The Earl of Albemarle; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 19, [180] 437

Slave Trade, The
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 28, [177] 846; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 26, [179] 877; Question, Lord Brougham; Answer, Earl Granville *June* 16, [180] 333; Observations, Lord Brougham; Reply, Earl Russell *June* 19, 431; Personal Explanation, Lord Brougham *July* 3, 1025

Small Benefices (Ireland) Act (1860) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Whiteside*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 13 [Bill 13]
Read 2° after debate *Mar* 22, [178] 50
Committee*; Report *Mar* 29
Considered* *Mar* 31
Read 3°* *April* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*The Archbishop of Dublin*) *April* 4
Read 2ª* *June* 20 (No. 61)
Considered in Committee *June* 22, [180] 626
Report* *June* 23 (No. 205)
Read 3ª* *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 82]

Smith, General Sir J. M. F., *Chatham*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1803;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 146, 243, 253;—Administration of the Army, 989
Army—Regimental Quartermasters, [177] 115;—Rifle Brigade and Whitworth Rifles, 1920, 1921
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1594, 1595, 1596; Papers moved for, [178] 829
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1940
Harbours of Refuge, Res. [180] 164, 173, 177
Navy Armaments, Comm. moved for, [177] 997
Navy—Board of Admiralty, [178] 709;—Dockyard Superintendents, [180] 751
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1416;—Wages to Artificers at Home, [178] 946;—New Works, &c. [179] 926
Piers and Harbours (Scotland), [179] 919
Railway Accidents, Res. [177] 1130
Supply—Consular Establishments Abroad, [179] 1292

Smith, Margaret, or Swanson, Case of
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 23, [178] 84

Smith, Mr. Augustus, *Truro*
British Museum, Enlargement of the, [179] 391, 488
Civil Service Estimates, [177] 1906; Amendt. [178] 717, 718, 734; [179] 593
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 12, [180] 669
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [180] 673; Comm. *cl.* 1, 717
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 14, [180] 682
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction (Judges' Salaries), Res. [180] 527
Dwellings for the Working Classes, [177] 1525
Education—Endowments for, Minute of Council, [178] 1536
Forms of the House, [180] 409
Ireland—Military occupation of the Curragh, [178] 1570
Isle of Man, Disafforestation (Compensation), Comm. [177] 1457; 3R. Amendt. [178] 1520, 1521
Mines, Comm. moved for, [179] 73
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [178] 730;—New Works, &c. [179] 929, 940
Office of Works, Comm. moved for, [178] 8

[*cont.*

SMITH, Mr. Augustus—*cont.*

Poor Law Board, [177] 237;—Secretary to the, Res. 456, 459, 468
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 415
Supply—Public Buildings, [179] 241;—Royal Parks, 244;—Harbours of Refuge, 595;—Lighthouses Abroad, 596;—Lunatic Asylum, Isle of Man, 597;—Treasury, 606;—Board of Trade, 610, 611;—Works and Public Buildings, 702, 703;—Office of Works, &c. 943, 945, 948;—National Gallery, 1271, 1275;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277;—Bermudas, 1280;—Consular Establishments Abroad, 1284;—Ministers at Foreign Courts, 1293;—Special Missions, 1295;—Superannuation Allowances, 1296, 1297; Amendt. 1298
Westminster Improvement Commission, Return moved for, [179] 209; Amendt. [180] 43, 44

SMITH, Mr. J. B., *Stockport*

Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 824
Colonies, Protection of the, [179] 914
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1145;—Tea, 1240, 1242
India—The Budget, [179] 1119; [180] 260
Timber Duties, [177] 1480

Smithfield Market (Dublin) Bill
(*Mr. Scully, Mr. Leader*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 10]

Smoke Nuisances (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. W. Miller, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Black*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 139]
Read 2° * *May* 17
Committee *; Report *May* 25
Read 3° * *May* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 30
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 136)
Committee * *June* 20; Report * *June* 22
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 102]

SMOLLETT, Mr. P. B., *Dumbartonshire*

Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1682
India—Madras Irrigation Company, [177] 598;—Navigation of the Godavery, 658;—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 407;—India Office, Address moved, [178] 1368
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 101

SMYTH, Colonel J. G., *York City*

Wakefield Gaol, [177] 1090

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (Sir R. P. Collier), *Plymouth*

Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1697
Juries in Criminal Cases, 2R. [177] 1721
Law of Evidence, &c. Leave, [177] 260; Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 313
Leeds Court of Bankruptcy, Comm. moved for, [179] 784
Merchant Shipping Disputes, 2R. [180] 603
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1293; Comm. *cl.* 1, [179] 527
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 478

SOMERSET, Duke of (First Lord of the Admiralty)

Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report [177] 438
Colonial Naval Defence, 2R. [178] 272
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), 3R. *add. cl.* [178] 1588
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 37
Greenwich Hospital, 2R. [180] 855, 857
Navy—Masters in the, [179] 384, 387;—Captains on the Reserved List, [180] 977;—Warrant Officers, 981
Tyne Improvement, 3R. [180] 849

Soulage Collection, The

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House Copies of Correspondence relating to the purchase of the Soulage Collection for the South Kensington Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*), [180] 410; Question, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

South American Beef

Question, Mr. J. C. Ewart; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 14, [177] 1661

South Kensington New Road Bill

c. Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*) *June* 16, [180] 60; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. J. E. Denison), *Nottinghamshire, N.*

Amendment—Order of moving—Motion, "That a Select Committee be appointed, &c." (Sir J. Pakington)—Amendment, to add certain words (Mr. Walter)—Mr. H. Seymour proposed an addition to the Order of Reference. Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member could not move the Amendment at present. No Amendment having been proposed to the first branch of the Original Motion, that part would stand and would have to be submitted to the House in its complete form. But the Question now before the House was whether the words proposed by the hon. Member for Berkshire should be added; and if any hon. Member proposed an Amendment on those words it would be open to the consideration of the House.—*Motion for a Select Committee on Education,* [177] 916

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Amendment—An Amendment on the Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," would, if agreed to, negative the Motion to go into Committee.—*Poor Law Board Continuance Bill*, [180] 720

Bills—What to originate in Committee of the Whole House—Mr. Cowper having moved for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the Commissioners of Works and Buildings "to acquire additional Lands for improving the Site of the New Public Offices in Downing Street and the Approaches thereto," it was objected that the Bill ought to originate in a Committee of the Whole House. Mr. Speaker said the object of the Bill was to enable the Government to take ground for certain purposes—it did not give them the power to purchase the property; the funds for that purpose should be voted afterwards in Committee of the Whole House—There was, therefore, no question of Order.—*Public Offices (Site and Approaches) Bill*, [177] 1301, 1308

Bills — Amendments — Relevancy to subject-matter of Bill—On debate on *Union Chargeability Bill*, Mr. Speaker said the hon. Member for Shoreham (Mr. Cave) had introduced the question of Mines; but in a conversation with him he had pointed out to him that the clause was not relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, [179] 342

Bill—Reading a Bill—No doubt according to ancient usage the clerk at the table may be called upon to read a Bill, which the House has ordered to be read a [second] time—This usage is now quite obsolete, and the modern practice is a sufficient reading.—*Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill*, [178] 181

Bills—Public and Private Bills—The *Liverpool Licensing Bill*, introduced as a Private Bill, proposed to alter the general law of the country in respect of licensing and licences as applicable to the borough of Liverpool—Objected, that it was a subject not proper to be dealt with by a Private Bill. Mr. Speaker said that the Bill was brought in in the ordinary manner upon petition. He must draw a distinction between the form of the Bill and the subject-matter of the Bill. There was nothing contrary to form in the manner in which the Bill had been introduced. Whether the subject-matter of the Bill was proper for a Private Bill was for the House, not for Mr. Speaker, to decide.—*Liverpool Licensing Bill*, [177] 653

Bills—"Hybrid" Bills — According to the General Local Government Act the proper course is that a Local Government Bill, against which a petition is presented, shall be referred to a Select Committee, [178] 1034

Bills—"Hybrid" Bills—When a Bill is introduced into this House as a Public Bill which involves private interests, it is subjected to the same examination which is provided for Private Bills; but strictly Private Bills are never turned into hybrids. — *Westminster Improvement Bill*, [180] 44

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Bills—Private Bills—Appointment of Referees. Mr. Speaker acquaints the House that he has appointed Mr. Hugh Adair and Mr. Hassard, Members of this House, together with Mr. Rickards, his Counsel, to serve as Referees on Private Bills under the Standing Order of last Session, [177] 98

Private Bills—The Court of Referees—Mr. Speaker offers his personal thanks to those Gentlemen who had taken upon themselves the duties of the Court of Referees at his request, [180] 876

Committee—Instruction—Order for Committee read: Mr. Bentinck moved an Instruction to Committee: Mr. Villiers objected—That the Poor Law Board had at present ample power to do what the right hon. Gentleman pointed at (to alter the limits of existing Unions). Mr. Speaker said, "The Question is, not whether the Poor Law Board has the power, but whether the Committee on this Bill would have the power without the Instruction to do so; and, in Mr. Speaker's opinion, the Committee would not have that power, because the subject-matter would not be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill.— *Union Chargeability Bill*, [179] 116

Committee—Instruction—Time for Moving—The proper time for moving an Instruction to a Committee on a Bill is after the Order of the Day, and before the Motion "That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair."—*Union Chargeability Bill*, [179] 116

Debate—Explanation—A Member may explain what requires explanation in his own speech, but he must not reply.—*Dockyard Superintendents—Resolution*, [180] 397

Debate—Effect of negativing the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the Amendment thereon—Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" an Amendment moved; Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and negatived; Question, "That the words, &c., be added instead thereof," put, and negatived. Mr. Hanbury Tracy rose to address the House. Lord R. Montagu asked whether it was competent to address the House on the word "That" (being the only word left of the original Motion). Mr. Speaker said the noble Lord had justly pointed out what the course of the House had been. It had negatived the Motion that I do leave the Chair, and it had declined to add the words which were just now the subject of discussion: but he (Mr. Speaker) apprehended that the hon. Member (Mr. Tracy) was about to supply the deficiency, by suggesting some words to be added to the word "That," which might, perhaps, be more acceptable to the House.—*Dockyard Superintendents—Resolution*, [180] 400

In such a case it is necessary, in order to the due forms of the House, that any hon. Member addressing the House should conclude with a Motion; it is also necessary that due notice should have been given of that Motion, [180] 410

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Debate—Premature discussion of a Motion—To discuss a Motion of which Notice has been given, but which is not yet before the House, not in order, [180] 1092

Amendment—An Amendment on the Question "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" would, if agreed to, negative the Motion to go into Committee.—*Poor Law Board Continuance Bill,* [180] 720

Debate—Resolutions in Supply—There are two opportunities upon which any hon. Member desiring to address the House on the subject of the Defences of Canada (the subject of a previous Resolution) might have done so—one upon the Question that the Resolution should be read a second time, and the other upon the Question that the House should agree with the Committee in the Resolution relating to that subject, [178] 362

Debate—Interruption of a Member speaking for the purpose of explanation, irregular.—*Law of Landlord and Tenant* (*Ireland*), [178] 619; [179] 572

Debate—Latitude of speaking in presenting Documents—Mr. H. A. Bruce in laying a Minute of the Council of Education on the table proposed to make an explanatory statement—Mr. A. Smith rose to Order—He desired to know whether it was competent to the right hon. Gentleman to make a statement on papers only just laid on the table. Mr. Speaker said there was nothing out of order in the course the right hon. Gentleman was pursuing.—*Endowments for Education—Minute of Council,* [178] 1536

Debate—Reference to a previous Debate—The hon. Member (Mr. Roebuck) is not confining himself to a personal explanation—He states that the whole transaction to which he is referring is a disgrace to Her Majesty's Government—meaning the whole subject of the debate which has recently taken place. It is for the House to say whether that is regular; but, in my opinion, the course which has been pursued in reviving a discussion which lately took place, is not in accordance with the Rules of the House.—*The Ionian Islands Debate,* [178] 378

Debate—Reference to anything said in a previous debate against the Rules of the House, [177] 1928, 1930; [179] 433, 1041 [180] 267

Debate—Reference to a Speech made in the other House of Parliament irregular, [177] 1557; [179] 770, 849

Debate—A letter commenting on a debate in this House is not in order, [178] 373

Debate—Relevancy to Question—In debate on the *Union Chargeability Bill,* reference was made to the rating of mines. Mr. Speaker said, that to discuss the subject of mines was not relevant to the matter before the House, [179] 342; [180] 836

Debate—Relevancy in—Resolutions in Supply, March 24, reported—Several Resolutions read 2° and agreed to—On Res. 9, Mr. Bentinck referred to the Vote for Defences of Canada, and moved the adjournment of the House. Mr. Speaker said, that to continue the discussion on a Resolution which had already been disposed of was quite irregular; the Question now before the House was that the House do agree with the Committee in the said Resolution—To that Resolution, therefore, the debate ought to be confined—Although the Motion for the adjournment had been regularly before the House, still it would not have been open to the hon. Member to enter on a discussion of the Vote for the Defences of Canada, which had already been agreed to.—*Supply—Resolutions, March 24, reported,* [178] 360

Form—Personal Explanation—Motion — Mr. Baillie Cochrane having offered a personal explanation concluded by moving "That the House do now adjourn." Mr. Speaker observed, that the hon. Member would better satisfy the Rules of the House by not moving the adjournment.—*The Ionian Islands Debate,* [178] 374

Motion—Time for making—Sir Charles Douglas having put a Question of which he had given notice, concluded by moving "That this House do now adjourn." Mr. Speaker said, This is the time for the Questions—The Motion of the hon. Gentleman should have been made at the time of the Notices of Motion.—*Convictions under Refreshment Houses Act,* [177] 452

Notice—Command Papers—Mr. H. A. Bruce having presented, by command, a Minute of the Council of Education, proposed to make an explanatory statement—Sir J. Pakington objected that no notice had been given. Mr. Speaker said, that the fact that the paper was laid upon the table by command caused a distinction as to the necessity of giving notice.—*Endowments for Education—Minute of Council,* [178] 1537

Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day—Mr. Speaker informs the House that he has directed that a copy of all Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day standing on the Order Book of the House be circulated among Members every Saturday morning, [177] 322

Order—Motion, "That this House do now adjourn"—Colonel Greville, having put a Question of which he had given notice, followed by some observations, "put himself in order" by moving the adjournment of the House—Mr. Baillie Cochrane rose to order. Mr. Speaker said, that the House had reserved to its Members the right of moving the adjournment.—*Administration of Justice in Ireland,* [177] 1829

Public Documents—Mr. Ferrand asked the Attorney General to inform the House by whose authority the written statement was prepared from which, on Monday last, he read his replies to the Questions relating to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court [and as to other papers read on the same occasion]—The Attorney General commented on the extraordinary nature of the Question, and declined to treat the papers referred to as public documents. Mr. Speaker said, public despatches, documents, and papers relating to public affairs, [*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*
if read and quoted by Ministers, may be called for to be laid on the table; but the Attorney General has stated the distinction which he draws in this case, and which distinction certainly appears to me to be a just one.—*The Leeds Registrarship—Question,* [179] 489

Public Documents—Reading of Documents in this House—Sir R. Peel proposing to read the opinion of the Attorney General for Ireland in reference to the O'Connell Procession in Dublin, Sir H. Cairns rose to order—he desired also to hear the statement of facts on which the opinion was based—Mr. Whiteside also rose to Order—he had always understood that the opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown given to the Crown were private communications, and they had always been refused by the Government. Mr. Speaker said, the Orders of the House are not in any way involved in the proceeding—If a document is read in the House it may be called for and made a public document; but its production in debate is not against the Rules of the House.—*Riots in Belfast—The Royal Commission,* [177] 354, 355

Select Committee—Addition to a Select Committee—It is out of Order to move an addition to the Committee without due notice.—*Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act,* [178] 956

Special Missions—Viscount Amberley's Travelling Expenses
Question, Mr. Hennessy; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 19, [180] 449

SPENCER, Earl
Union Chargeability, 2R. [180] 27

STACPOOLE, Captain W., *Ennis*
Drainage Act (Ireland), [178] 1317
Railway Travelling (Ireland), 2R. [178] 66
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 588

Stage Carriages, Mileage Duties on
Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 15, [180] 261

Stamp Duties on Marriage Certificates
Question, Sir James Fergusson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 15, [179] 298

Stamp Duty on Highway Contracts
Question, Mr. Trefusis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 19, [180] 446

Standing Orders Committee
On Feb 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, Mr. Wrighton, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Bramston, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Lefroy, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Paget
(See title *Private Bills*)

STANHOPE, Earl
British Museum, [177] 956, 1530
Clerical Subscription, Report, [179] 1046
Committees on Private Bills, Return moved for, [180] 1036
Courts of Justice, The New, Returns moved for, [177] 1910, 1919
Divisions, Manner of taking—Standing Order, [179] 958
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257
Miniatures, Exhibition of, at South Kensington, [180] 332
Museums, &c. Public, [180] 970, 971
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 641, 646; Select Comm. 1304
Select Committees, Res. [178] 1531; Reports of, Res. [179] 484

STANHOPE, Mr. J. Banks, *Lincolnshire, N.*
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. [178] 1302
Lancashire and Yorkshire and Great Eastern Junction Railway, 2R. [177] 1658
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. Adj. moved, [179] 617
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 299

STANILAND, Mr. M., *Boston*
Established Church Service — Rev. A. D. Wagner, Comm. moved for, [179] 771, 773
India—Claims of the Satpoora and Goa Frontier Field Forces, [180] 748
St. George's-in-the-East, Explanation, [179] 977
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 304

STANLEY, Right Hon. Lord, *King's Lynn*
Africa — Western Coast, Comm moved for, [177] 550, 554;—War at Lagos, [179] 389
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 455
County Voters Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 103
India—Talookdars and Cultivators of Oude, [177] 138;—Affairs of Bhootan, 206;—Affairs of Oude, 1830;—Land Tenures of Oude, [179] 114; [180] 447;—Transport of Troops to, [179] 114; — Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, 402
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 651
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1505, 1510, 1512
Patent Laws, [180] 448
Patent Office, Alleged Irregularities in the, [177] 1120
Private Bills—Standing Order No. 7, [177] 105

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord (Postmaster General)
Alkali Act—Inspector's Report, [179] 636
Business, Public and Private, State of, [180] 691, 693, 695, 764
Destruction of Metropolitan Dwellings by Railways, [178] 555
General Post Office (Additional Site), 2R. [179] 1186
Local Government Supplemental (No. 4), 2R. [180] 255
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. [180] 257
Patent Rights, [177] 635
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [180] 116; Report, 715

Stanley of Alderley, Lord—*cont.*
Penalties Law Amendment, 2R. [180] 968, 969; Report, *cl.* 4, 1144
Private Bill Costs, Report, *add. cl.* [178] 483
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), 2R. [179] 560
Salmon Fishery Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 14, [180] 858
Standing Order No. 191—Displacement of London Poor, [178] 875

Stanley, Hon. W. O., *Beaumaris*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 657; Address moved, 905
Azeem Jah (Signatures to Petitions), Report, Res. [178] 1613; Comm. [179] 60
Forms of the House, [180] 409
Italy—Capture of English Subjects by Brigands [180] 539
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 392;—Loss of the "Bombay," 629, 631
North Pole, Expedition to the, [178] 53

Stansfeld, Mr. J., *Halifax*
Borough Franchise Extension, 2R. [178] 1666
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1437, 1444

State Papers, The
Observations, Mr. Henry Seymour; Reply, Mr. Layard *April* 6, [178] 789

Statute Law Revision Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 19 (No. 172)

Stirling, Mr. W., *Perthshire*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 537

Stonor's, Mr. H. J., Appointment
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 31, [178] 563

Stracey, Sir H. J., *Great Yarmouth*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 660
Courts of Justice Building—Petition, [180] 251
Great Yarmouth Borough, Haven and Port, 2R. [177] 745
Militia Travelling Allowances, [177] 846

Stratford de Redcliffe, Viscount
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 659
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 821
Sarawak—Consul at, [180] 690
Turkey and Persia—Boundary Negotiations, Papers moved for, [177] 1726, 1732
United States—Assassination of President Lincoln, Address moved, [178] 1226

Stratheden and Campbell, Lord
Private Bills—Standing Orders, [180] 917
Public Schools, 2R. [178] 667

Strikes and Lock-Outs
Observations, Lord St. Leonards, [178] 1575
(See *Masters and Operatives Bill*)

Suez Canal, The
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *Mar* 16, [177] 1759

Sugar Duties and Drawbacks Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peel*)
c. Resolutions considered in Committee * *June* 1; Report *; Ordered * *June* 2
Presented; read 1° * *June* 2 [Bill 198]
Read 2° * *June* 8
Committee; Report *June* 15, [180] 280
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 19, 514; as amended considered
Read 3° *June* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 23
Read 2ª * *June* 26 (No. 195)
Committee *; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 95]

SUPPLY, 1865
Lords Commissioners' Speech consid. *Feb* 9; Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty;" Committee thereupon to-morrow
Order for Committee on Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty," read
Lords Commissioners' Speech referred *Feb* 10
Resolved, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty"
Resolution reported, and agreed to *Nem. Con.* *Feb* 13—Committee appointed for Wednesday
Considered in Committee *Feb* 27—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *Mar* 2—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *Mar* 3—r.p.*
177] Considered in Committee; Navy Estimates *Mar* 6 — Statement of Lord Clarence Paget on moving Vote 1, 1171; after long debate, Committee—r.p.
Considered in Committee; Navy Estimates *Mar* 9, 1373
Redemption of the Scheldt Toll *Mar* 9, 1456; after short debate, Vote agreed to
Considered in Committee *Mar* 10—r.p.*
Considered in Committee *Mar* 13—r.p.*
Considered in Committee; Army Estimates *Mar* 16 — Statement of The Marquess of Hartington on moving First Resolution, 1761; after long debate, Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow
Considered in Committee *Mar* 17—r.p.*
Considered in Committee; Army Estimates
178] *Mar* 20, 1955—Resolutions reported * *Mar* 21
Considered in Committee; Army Estimates *Mar* 23, 94—r.p.
Considered in Committee; Army Estimates *Mar* 24, 243—Resolutions reported *Mar* 27, 359
Considered in Committee; Navy Estimates *April* 3, 726—Civil Service Estimates, 733—Resolutions reported * *April* 5
[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

178] Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates—On Account; Army Estimates *April* 6, 852—Resolutions reported * *April* 7
Considered in Committee; Navy Estimates *April* 7, 946—Resolutions reported * *April* 24
Considered in Committee; Army and Navy Estimates *April* 24, 959—Resolutions reported *April* 25, 1035
Considered in Committee *May* 5—R.P.*
179] Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *May* 12, 241—Resolutions reported *May* 15, 371
Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *May* 19, 594—Resolutions reported * *May* 22
Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *May* 22, 702—Resolutions reported * *May* 25
Considered in Committee; Navy Estimates—Civil Service Estimates *May* 26, 921—Resolutions reported * *May* 29
Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *June* 1, 1135—Resolutions reported *June* 2, 1260
Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *June* 2, 1248—Resolutions reported * *June* 8
Considered in Committee; Civil Service Estimates *June* 8, 1271—Resolutions re-
180] ported *June* 12, 106
Considered in Committee; Post Office Packet Service *June* 19, 471—Resolutions reported * *June* 20

THE SCHELDT TOLL—SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE.

Committee *Mar* 9—Report *Mar* 10.

	£
£175,650, Moiety of Charge for the Redemption of the Scheldt Toll After short debate, Vote agreed to *Mar* 9 ... ... [177] 1456 Resolutions reported *Mar* 10	175,650

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1865-6.

Committee *Mar* 6.

Statement of Lord Clarence Paget, Secretary of the Admiralty, on moving the First Vote, "That 69,750 Men and Boys, including 17,000 Marines, be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Service for the year 1865-6" [177] 1146
After long debate, Committee report Progress

Committee *Mar* 9—Report *Mar* 10.

	Numbers.
Question [March 6] again proposed, and, after further long debate, Resolution agreed to [177] 1373	69,750

	Total of Vote. £
(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines ..	2,945,006
(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto ..	1,325,694
Committee *April* 3—Report *April* 5.	
(3.) Admiralty Office [178] 726 After short debate, Vote agreed to	175,957
(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and Royal Naval Reserve ... ... [178] 727 After short debate, Vote agreed to	284,395
(5.) Scientific Branch [178] 730 After short debate, Vote agreed to	70,042
(6.) £192,415, Her Majesty's Establishments at Home ... [178] 732 Motion to report Progress (*Sir James Elphinstone*); A. 27, N. 51; M. 24 After short debate, Vote agreed to ...	192,415
(7.) Her Majesty's Naval Establishments Abroad ... [178] 733	37,332
Committee *April* 7—Report *April* 24.	
(8.) £1,158,797, Wages to Artificers, &c., employed in Her Majesty's Establishments at Home [178] 733 After short debate, Motion withdrawn Question [April 3] again proposed, 946 Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,148,020, &c.," (*Mr. Seely*) After debate, Question negatived Original Question agreed to ...	1,158,797
(9.) Wages to Artificers, &c., employed in Her Majesty's Establishments Abroad	72,585
Committee *April* 24—Report *April* 25.	
(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard; Steam Machinery; and Ships built by Contract:	
Section I. Storekeeper General of the Navy	1,134,572
Section II. Controller of the Navy After short debate, Vote agreed to [178] 995	564,700
Committee *May* 26—Report *May* 29.	
(11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs ... [179] 921 After long debate, Vote agreed to	527,985
Committee *April* 7—Report *April* 24.	
(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [178] 954	64,800
(13.) Miscellaneous Services ...	103,925
Total for the Effective Service ...	8,658,205
Committee *April* 24—Report *April* 25.	
(14.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines ... ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [178] 996	698,195
(15.) Military Pensions and Allowances	507,211
(16.) Civil Pensions and Allowances ..	208,033
Total for the Naval Service ..	10,071,644

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
FOR THE SERVICE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT.	
(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops)	£ 320,580
Resolutions reported *April* 25; and, after debate, agreed to [178] 1035	
Total	£10,392,224

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE.

COMMITTEE *June* 19—REPORT *June* 20.

(18.) GREENWICH HOSPITAL

For the Establishment of the Hospital and Infirmary, from the 1st October 1865 ...	34,000	
For the Establishment of the School, from the same date	11,500	
For Pensions to Flag Officers and other Officers, from the same date	915	
For Pensions and Allowances to 3,000 Seamen, from the same date	17,000	
For Gratuities to Widows of Seamen, from the same date	500	
Total		£63,915
Grand Total		£10,456,139

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1865-6.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 16.

Statement of the Under Secretary of State for War on moving Resolution (A) [177] 1761

NUMBERS.	*Numbers.*
(A.) General Staff, Regimental and Military Educational Establishments	142,477
(B.) Native Indian Troops employed on the British Establishment ...	178
After long debate, Resolution agreed to	

I.—REGULAR FORCES.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 16—REPORT *Mar* 17.

(1.) £5,434,567, General Staff and Regimental Pay, Allowances and Charges
Whereupon Amendt. "That item £691 19*s.* 7*d.* for Major General attached to the Foot Guards, be omitted from the Vote (*Sir John Trelawny*)
After debate, Question put, A. 27, N. 47; M. 20
Committee report Progress [177] 1821

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 21.	
Original Question again proposed, and, after further long debate, agreed to [177] 1955	£ 5,434,567
(2.) Commissariat Establishment, Services, and Movement of Troops ...	1,205,800
(3.) Clothing Establishments, Services and Supplies .. [177] 1974	574,256
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(4.) Barrack Establishment, Services and Supplies	609,900
(5.) Divine Service [177] 1974	44,335
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(6.) Martial Law .. [177] 1974	26,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) Medical Establishment, Services and Supplies	246,544
II.—AUXILIARY FORCES.	
(8.) Disembodied Militia [177] 1976	786,400
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) £91,000, Yeomanry [177] 1980	
Whereupon Amendt. "That a sum, not exceeding £47,807, &c." (*Mr. Lawson*)	
After short debate, Amendt. withdrawn	
Vote agreed to	91,000
(10.) Volunteers ... [177] 1983	334,900
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(11.) Enrolled Pensioners and Army Reserve Force ... [177] 1983	46,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
III.—STORES.	
(12.) £972,900, Manufacturing Departments ... ... [177] 1986	
Whereupon Amendt. "That £93,556 for materials at the Royal Gun Factories be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Colonel Sykes*)	
After short debate, Amendt. withdrawn	
Vote agreed to	972,900
(13.) Warlike Stores	485,000
IV.—WORKS AND BUILDINGS.	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 23.	
(14.) £811,400, Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings and Repairs, at Home and Abroad [178] 94	
Motion, "That Item £50,000, for the Improvement of Defences at Quebec, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Bentinck*), 104	
After long debate; A. 40, N. 275; M. 235; Division List, 176	
Committee report Progress	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 24—REPORT *Mar* 27.	
Original Question [March 23] again proposed, and, after long debate, Vote agreed to, 243	811,400
V.—OTHER SERVICES.	
COMMITTEE *Mar* 24—REPORT *Mar* 27.	
(15.) Military Education [178] 256	163,500
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) Surveys of the United Kingdom	88,345

[*cont*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(17.) Miscellaneous Services [178] 262 After short debate, Vote agreed to Resolutions reported *Mar* 24, and, after debate, agreed to, 359	107,700

COMMITTEE *April* 24—REPORT *April* 25.

(18.) Administration of the Army ... After long debate, Vote agreed to [178] 959	212,800
Total Effective Services	£12,241,647

VI.—NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 24—REPORT *Mar* 27.

(19.) Rewards for Military Service ...	26,100
(20.) Pay of General Officers ...	74,200
(21.) £455,000, Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers [178] 263 Motion to report Progress (*Mr. Torrens*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ...	455,000
(22.) Widows' Pensions and Compassionate Allowances ...	162,100
(23.) Pensions and Allowances to Wounded Officers ...	28,200
(24.) £33,200, In-Pension [178] 264 Motion to report Progress (*Colonel Dickson*) put, and agreed to Resolutions reported *Mar* 27; and, after debate, agreed to, 359	

COMMITTEE *April* 6—REPORT *April* 7.

Motion to report Progress (*General Peel*), 851 After short debate, Motion withdrawn Original Question [March 24] again proposed, and, after short debate, Vote agreed to ...	33,200
(25.) Out-Pension ...	1,168,000
(26.) Superannuation Allowances, &c. Motion to report Progress (*Colonel Dunne*) negatived Vote agreed to [178] 858	131,000
(27.) Disembodied Militia [178] 858 After short debate, Vote agreed to	29,000
Total Non-Effective Services ...	£2,106,800

RECAPITULATION.

Total Effective Services ...	12,241,647
Total Non-Effective Services ...	2,106,800
Grand Total, Army Services...	£14,348,447

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1865-6.

⁎ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

COMMITTEE *May* 12—REPORT *May* 15.

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(1.) Royal Palaces ...	48,836
(2.) Public Buildings ... [179] 241 After short debate, Vote agreed to	100,590
(3.) Furniture of Public Offices ...	12,000
(4.) Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens ... [179] 242 After short debate, Vote agreed to	99,090
(5.) New Houses of Parliament ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 247	49,456
(6.) British Embassy Houses, Paris and Madrid ...	5,708
(7.) British Consulate and Embassy Houses, Constantinople ...	3,455
(8.) New Foreign Office ...	60,000
(9.) Industrial Museum, Edinburgh...	9,139
(10.) Probate Court and Registries ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 253	17,893
(11.) Public Record Repository ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 253	28,750
(12.) New Westminster Bridge ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 253	12,000
(13.) Nelson Column ... [179] 255 After short debate, Vote agreed to	9,500
(14.) Patent Office ... [179] 255 After short debate, Vote agreed to	4,500
(15.) Metropolitan Fire Brigade ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 256	10,000
(16.) Public Offices, Site [179] 259 After short debate, Vote agreed to	20,000
(17.) Legation House, Tangier ...	1,559

COMMITTEE *May* 19—REPORT *May* 22.

(18.) Harbours of Refuge [179] 594 After short debate, Vote agreed to	76,000
(19.) Holyhead and Port Patrick Harbours, &c. ... [179] 595 After short debate, Vote agreed to	49,930
(20.) †£70,677, Public Buildings, Ireland ... [179] 595 After short debate, Vote agreed to	103,677
(21.) †£3,000, New Record Buildings, Dublin ... [179] 595 After short debate, Vote agreed to	6,000
(22.) National Gallery, Dublin ...	813
(23.) Lighthouses Abroad [179] 595 After short debate, Vote agreed to	19,474
(24.) Isle of Man Lunatic Asylum After debate, the Committee divided; A. 49, N. 33; M. 16 Vote agreed to [179] 596	4,000
(25.) Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 601	20,000
(26.) Rates for Government Property After debate, Vote agreed to [179] 601	27,000
(27.) Landguard Point Works (*Supp.*)	10,000
(28.) National Gallery Enlargement (*Supp.*) ...	20,000
Total of Class I. ...	£829,370

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

COMMITTEE *May* 19—REPORT *May* 22.

(1.) † £51,064, Two Houses of Parliament, Offices ... [179] 604 After short debate, Vote agreed to	69,064

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(2.) † £39,188, Treasury [179] 605	53,488
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(3.) † £20,118, Home Office [179] 606	27,118
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(4.) † £48,885, Foreign Office [179] 606	66,885
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(5.) † £23,658, Colonial Office... ...	31,658
(6.) † £13,842, Privy Council Office	20,842
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 607	
(7.) † £50,523, Board of Trade, &c.	68,523
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 609	
COMMITTEE *May* 22—REPORT *May* 25.	
(8.) † £1,938, Privy Seal Office ...	2,938
(9.) † £5,874, Civil Service Commission	8,874
(10.) † £14,391, Paymaster General's Office	20,391
(11.) † £3,048, Exchequer (London)	5,048
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 702	
† £24,148, Office of Works and Public Buildings ... [179] 702	
After long debate, Motion, by leave, withdrawn	
(13.) † £20,482, Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues ... [179] 704	
After long debate, Committee report Progress	
COMMITTEE *June* 19—REPORT *June* 20.	
After short debate, Vote agreed to [180] 478 ...	28,482
COMMITTEE *May* 26—REPORT *May* 29.	
(12.) † £24,148, Office of Works and Public Buildings [179] 943	32,148
After long debate, Vote agreed to	
COMMITTEE *June* 1—REPORT *June* 2.	
(14.) † £16,006, Public Record Office...	22,006
(15.) † £217,392, Poor Law Commissions	237,392
(16.) † £35,075, Mint, including Coinage	49,075
(17.) † £26,826, Inspectors of Factories, Fisheries, &c.	36,826
(18.) † £4,210, Exchequer and other Offices in Scotland	6,210
(19.) † £4,413, Household of Lord Lieutenant, Ireland	6,413
(20.) † £11,609, Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices	16,609
(21.) † £3,007, Inspection, &c., of Lunatic Asylums, Ireland	4,007
(22.) † £16,861, Office of Public Works, Ireland	22,861
(23.) † £27,559, Audit Office	36,559
(24.) † £14,187, Copyhold, Tithe, and Inclosure Commission	19,187
(25.) † £9,290, Inclosure and Drainage Acts; Imprest Expenses	13,290
(26.) † £48,493, General Register Offices, England, Ireland, and Scotland	65,493
(27.) † £11,510, National Debt Office	15,510
(28.) † £2,785, Public Works Loan Commission and West India Relief Commission ... ... [179] 1136	3,785
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
	[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(29.) † £7,635, Lunacy Commissions	9,635
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1136	
(30.) † £1,223, Superintendent of Roads South Wales ... ... [179] 1137	1,223
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(31.) † £1,324, Registrars of Friendly Societies ... ... [179] 1137	2,324
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(32.) † £13,915, Charity Commission	18,915
(33.) † £4,665, Local Government Act Office and Inspection of Burial Grounds	6,665
(34.) † £1,350, Landed Estates Record Offices	2,350
(35.) † £446, Quarantine Expenses ...	1,446
(36.) † £24,000, Secret Service ...	32,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1138	
(37.) † £265,410, Printing and Stationery ... ... [179] 1140	365,410
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(38.) † £114,535, Postage of Public Departments...	149,535
Total of Class II. ...	£1,580,185
CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.	
COMMITTEE *June* 1—REPORT *June* 2.	
(1.) † £23,296, Law Charges, England	43,296
(2.) † £128,033, Criminal Prosecutions, &c.	198,033
(3.) † £183,100, Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain	248,100
(4.) † £2,120, Crown Office, Queen's Bench	3,120
(5.) † £9,325, Admiralty Court, Registry	12,325
(6.) † £2,296, Late Insolvent Debtors' Court	3,296
(7.) † £64,000, Probate Court ...	85,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1147	
(8.) † £119,701, County Courts ...	159,701
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1148	
(9.) † £3,030, Land Registry Office ...	5,030
(10.) † £15,993, Police Courts (Metropolis)	20,993
(11.) † £115,166, Metropolitan Police	155,166
(12.) Revising Barristers, England and Wales	18,002
(13.) Divorce Court Compensations ...	686
(14.) Bankruptcy Court Compensations	16,772
(15.) † £2,577, Lord Advocate and Solicitor General, Salaries	3,577
(16.) † £13,331, Court of Session ...	18,331
(17.) † £7,816, Court of Justiciary ...	10,816
(18.) Prosecutions under the Lord Advocate	4,100
(19.) † £630, Exchequer, Scotland, Legal Branch	1,630
(20.) † £31,231, Sheriffs and Procurators Fiscal not paid by Salaries, and Expenses of Prosecutions in Sheriff Courts	35,231
(21.) † £18,842, Procurators Fiscal, Salaries	21,842
	[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(22.) † £10,777, Sheriff Clerks ...	14,777
(23.) Expenses in matters of Tithes ...	3,000
(24.) † £13,254, Register House, Edinburgh, Salaries and Expenses of Sundry Departments	17,254
(25.) Commissary Clerk's Office ...	1,295
(26.) Accountant in Bankruptcy ...	1,529
(27.) † £53,637, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions (Ireland) ...	73,637
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1150	
(28.) † £3,793, Court of Chancery (Ireland)	5,793
(29.) † £9,742, Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer (Ireland)	13,742
(30.) Officers of the Judges on Circuit	4,407
(31.) † £1,403, Manor Courts Compensations	2,403
(32.) † £2,163, Registry of Judgments	3,163
(33.) Registry of Deeds	16,416
(34.) High Court of Delegates ...	100
(35.) † £4,599, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency	6,599
(36.) † £7,663, Court of Probate ...	10,663
(37.) † £8,768, Landed Estates Court	11,768
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1150	
(38.) † £5,500, Process Servers, Civil Bill Courts	8,500
(39.) Revising Barristers, Dublin ...	420
(40.) † 40,500, Dublin Metropolitan Police and Police Justices ...	50,500
(41.) † £525,680, Constabulary of Ireland ... ... [179] 1151	725,680
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(42.) † £1,714, Four Courts Marshalsea Prison	2,714
(43.) † £13,999, Inspection and General Superintendence of Prisons ...	18,999
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1152	
(44.) † £290,887, Prisons and Convict Establishments at Home ...	370,887
(45.) † £198,905, Maintenance of Prisoners in County Gaols, &c., and Removal of Convicts	288,905
(46.) † £10,258, Transportation of Convicts	20,258
(47.) Convict Establishments in the Colonies ... [179] 1259	159,059
Resolutions reported *June* 2, and, after short debate, agreed to	
Total of Class III.	£2,897,515

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

COMMITTEE *June* 1—REPORT *June* 2.

(1.) † £518,078, Public Education, Great Britain ... [179] 1153	693,078
After long debate, Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £116,841, Science and Art Department ... [179] 1163	
After long debate, Motion, "That Item £36,500, for Schools of Science and Art, be reduced by the amount of £1,000 (Salaries of Masters)" (*Mr. Edmund Potter*); A. 16, N. 80; M. 64	
Original Question again proposed [179] 1179	
Motion, "That Item £10,000, for the Purchase of Specimens, Ancient and Modern, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); A. 24, N. 81; M. 57	£
Original Question put, and agreed to	161,841
Resolutions reported *June* 2, and, after short debate, agreed to [179] 1259	

COMMITTEE *June* 2—REPORT *June* 8.

(3.) † £235,583, Public Education, Ireland ... [179] 1248	325,583
After long debate, Vote agreed to	
(4.) Commissioners of Education, Ireland (Office Expenses)	730
(5.) † £6,773, University of London ...	8,773
(6.) † £14,485, Universities, &c., in Scotland	19,485
(7.) Queen's University in Ireland ...	2,372
(8.) † £3,150, Queen's Colleges, Ireland	5,150
(9.) Royal Irish Academy	700
(10.) National Gallery of Ireland ...	3,400
(11.) † £1,500, Belfast Theological Professors, &c.	2,500

COMMITTEE *June* 9—REPORT *June* 20.

(12.) † £63,164, British Museum ...	98,164
After debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1348	

COMMITTEE *June* 8—REPORT *June* 12.

(13.) † £13,336, National Gallery ...	23,336
After long debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1271	
(14.) British Historical Portrait Gallery ... ... [179] 1276	1,650
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(15.) † £4,059, Scientific Works and Experiments ... [179] 1276	7,059
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) Universal Exhibition at Paris ...	5,000
(17.) Royal Geographical Society ...	500
(18.) Royal Society	1,000
(19.) Royal Academy of Music ...	500
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1280	
Total of Class IV. ...	..£1,360,821

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 8—REPORT *June* 12.

(1.) Bermudas ... [179] 1280	4,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £2,813, Clergy, North America	3,813
(3.) Indian Department, Canada ...	1,000
(4.) Governors and others, West Indies, &c.	23,278
(5.) † £6,200, Justices, West Indies ...	7,200
(6.) † £6,730, Western Coast of Africa	11,730
(7.) † £2,924, St. Helena	4,924

[cont.

[cont

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(8.) Orange River Territory ...	700
(9.) Heligoland	1,104
(10.) † £3,488, Falkland Islands ...	5,488
(11.) † £2,641, Labuan [179] 1281	4,641
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) Pitcairn's Islanders	300
(13.) Emigration	10,531
(14.) Zambesi Expedition	1,657
(15.) Treasury Chest	3,000
(16.) † £35,000, Captured Negroes, Bounties on Slaves, &c. [179] 1281	47,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(17.) † £7,650, Commissions for Suppression of Slave Trade ...	10,650
(18.) † £91,018, Consuls Abroad	
Motion, "That item £750, for the Salary of Her Majesty's Consul at St. Petersburg, be omitted from the proposed Vote (*Mr. Clay*); After short debate, Question put; A. 20, N. 50; M. 30 [179] 1282	
After further debate, Original Question put, and agreed to	166,018
(19.) Services in China, Japan, and Siam	102,972
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1292	
(20.) † £32,400, Ministers at Foreign Courts, Extraordinary Expenses ...	36,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1293	
(21.) † £19,000, Special Missions, Outfits, &c.... ... [179] 1294	25,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(22.) Third Secretaries to Embassies	4,500
Total of Class V.	£476,106

CLASS VI. — SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

COMMITTEE *June* 8—REPORT *June* 12.

(1.) † £119,382, Superannuation and Retired Allowances	
Motion, "That Item £400, for Retiring Allowance to Martin T. Hood, late Consul at Buenos Ayres, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*) [179] 1296	
After short debate, A. 13, N. 28; M. 15	
Original Question put, and agreed to	179,382
(2.) Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, &c., and American Loyalists	661
(3.) Refuge for the Destitute ...	325
(4.) † £1,789, Polish Refugees and Distressed Spaniards	2,789
(5.) Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions	54,200
(6.) † £21,400, Relief of Distressed British Seamen	30,400
(7.) † £2,780, Miscellaneous Charges, formerly on Civil List	3,780
(8.) Public Infirmaries, Ireland ...	2,272
(9.) † £1,600, Westmoreland Lock Hospital	2,600
(10.) Rotunda Lying-in Hospital ...	700
(11.) Coombe Lying-in Hospital ...	200

[cont.

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(12.) † £5,600, House of Industry Hospitals	7,600
(13.) † £1,500, Cork Street Fever Hospital	2,500
(14.) Meath Hospital	600
(15.) St. Mark's Opthalmic Hospital	100
(16.) † £300, Dr. Steevens's Hospital...	1,300
(17.) Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals	245
(18.) † £7,644, Concordatum Fund and other Charities and Allowances, Ireland	8,644
(19.) † £25,809, Non-conforming and other Ministers, Ireland	
Motion, "That a sum, not exceeding £25,509, &c." (*Sir Francis Crossley*) After debate, Question put; A. 14, N. 51; M. 37 [179] 1299	
Original Question put, and agreed to	40,809
Total of Class VI. ...	£339,107

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

COMMITTEE *June* 8—REPORT *June* 12.

(1.) Ecclesiastical Commissioners ...	3,750
(2.) † £22,702, Temporary Commissions	30,702
(3.) † £25,003, Patent Law Expenses	31,003
(4.) † £11,427, Fishery Board, Scotland ... ... [179] 1305	15,427
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(5.) Trustees of Manufactures, Scotland	2,000
(6.) † £39,532, Local Dues on Shipping under Treaties of Reciprocity	55,532
(7.) † £1,900, Inspectors of Corn Returns	2,900
(8.) Boundary Survey, Ireland ...	500
(9.) Brehon Laws, Ireland [179] 1308	500
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(10.) Flax Cultivation in Ireland ...	5,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1309	
(11.) Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, and Subsidies to Telegraph Companies ... [179] 1311	780
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) Agricultural Statistics, Great Britain	10,000
(13.) † £14,674, Miscellaneous Expenses from Civil Contingencies ...	16,674
After short debate, Vote agreed to [179] 1312	
Total of Class VII. ...	£174,768

CIVIL SERVICES—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

COMMITTEE *June* 19—REPORT *June* 20.

Class I. Vote 27. Landguard Point Works	10,000

COMMITTEE *June* 19—REPORT *June* 20.

Class I. Vote 28. National Gallery Enlargement	20,000
After long debate, Vote agreed to [180] 484	

[cont.

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Committee *June* 8—Report *June* 12.	£
Class VII. (Temporary Commissions) Digest of the Law of England ...	5,000

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1865-6.

Committee *June* 9—Report *June* 20.	£
Vote I. Customs (Salaries and Expenses)	773,009
Vote II. Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses)	1,284,157
Vote III. Post Office (Salaries and Expenses) ... [179] 1359	
After short debate, Vote agreed to...	2,121,478
Vote IV. Superannuations ...	478,116
Total of Revenue Departments...	£4,656,760

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Committee *June* 19—Report *June* 20.	£
New Courts of Justice and Offices, Advances for	700,000

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

Committee *June* 19—Report *June* 20.	
Post Office Packet Service ...	841,867
After short debate, Vote agreed to [180] 471	

EXCHEQUER BONDS

Committee *May* 19—Report *May* 22.	
£1,000,000, Exchequer Bonds ...	1,000,000

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Schedule of Ways and Means referred to in Section 10 of the Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Act—viz.:

	£	s.	d.
1864-5.			
Amount granted per Act 28 *Vict.* c. 4, for the service of the year ending 31 March 1865	175,650	0	0
1865-6.			
Amount granted for the service of the year ending 31 March 1866—viz.:			
Per Act 28 *Vict.* c. 10 ...	15,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of the Act	23,342,558	3	3
Per Section 9 of the Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the service of preceding years)	1,318,526	16	9
Total Grants of Ways and Means to meet the following Supplies:—			
1864-5 £175,650 1865-6 39,661,085	£39,836,735	0	0

SUMMARY.

Sums Voted in Supply, Session 1865.

1864-5.		
(Supplemental Votes.)		
Redemption of the Scheldt Toll...		£175,650
1865-6.		
Navy Services		10,456,139
Army Services		14,348,447
Exchequer Bonds		1,000,000
Civil Services—viz.:		
I. Public Works and Buildings... ...	£829,370	
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments ...	1,580,185	
III. Law and Justice	2,897,515	
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	1,360,821	
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	476,106	
VI. Superannuation, &c.	339,107	
VII. Miscellaneous..	174,768	
		7,657,872
Revenue Departments ...		4,656,760
Post Office Packet Service		841,867
Advances for New Courts of Justice and Offices		700,000
Total of Supplies chargeable upon the above Ways and Means—		
1864-5 £175,650 1865-6 39,661,085		£39,836,735

STUART, Colonel W., *Bedford*
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 53, [179] 1331

SURTEES, Mr. H. E., *Hertfordshire*
Army Estimates—Manufacturing Departments, [177] 1999
Army—Regimental Paymasters, [180] 366
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1150

SYDNEY, Viscount, (Lord Chamberlain)
Princess of Wales, Answer to Address, [180] 430
United States — Assassination of President Lincoln, Answer to Address, [178] 1451

SYKES, Colonel W. H., *Aberdeen City*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 79
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1801, 1816;—Pay and Allowances, 1964;—Manufacturing Departments, Amendt. 1989, 1991
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1715
Bankruptcy and Insolvency (Ireland) Act Amendment, Lords Amendts. [178] 786
Bath, Order of the, Address moved, [180] 406
Canada—Defences of, Papers moved for, [178] 811
China—British Subjects in the Chinese Service, [177] 287, 1945; [178] 782;—Piracy in, 888;—Proceedings in, 1239;—Dismissal of Prince Kung, [179] 1209
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), Consid. [180] 760; 3R. 841
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 294
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1130
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 956
India—Disinfecting Powder for, [177] 450;—Claims of the Satpoora and Goa Frontier Field Force, [180] 751
Indian Officers, Address moved, [178] 1342, 1353;—Grievances of, [180] 926
Judicial Statistics, Scotch, [177] 958
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 313
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1064
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1163, 1420
New Zealand—War in, [177] 1516
River Waters Protection, 2R. [177] 1344
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [179] 1263
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [180] 538
Supply, Report, [178] 1036;—Controller of the Exchequer, [179] 702;—Woods, Forests, &c. 704;—Lunacy Commissions, 1137;—Secret Service, 1139;—Consular Establishments, China, Japan, &c. 1292;—Ministers at Foreign Courts, 1293;—Special Missions, 1296;—Superannuation Allowances, 1298;—Post Office Department, 1359;—Post Office Packet Service, 1364; [180] 471
United States—Case of the "Saxon"—Mrs. Gray, [180] 131
Volunteer Rifles, Promotion in, [179] 47
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, [178] 1508
Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. [179] 1196

TAUNTON, Lord
British Kaffraria, 2R, [177] 1532
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 44
Railway Passengers, [180] 434
Transportation to Australia, [177] 737

Taxes, Collection of
Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 3, [178] 669

Tea—Financial Statement
Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 1, [178] 1240

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill
(*Mr. Goschen, Mr. Grant Duff*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 21 [Bill 85]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Goschen*) *June* 14, [180] 185
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Lord Robert Cecil*), 210; after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 206, N. 190; M. 16; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 247; main Question agreed to
Read 2° *June* 14
Bill withdrawn* *June* 28

Thames and Isis Navigation
Observations, Mr. Malins; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson; debate thereon *Mar* 24, [178] 223

Thames at Hampton Court
Question, Mr. Dawson-Damer; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 23, [178] 79

Thames Embankment, The
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 22, [180] 633

Thames River
Select Committee appointed *Mar* 31, [178] 629
And, on April 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Milner Gibson (Chairman), Mr. Malins, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Bathurst, Sir Frederick Smith, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Hankey Sir Francis Goldsmid, Mr. Neate, Mr. Baring, Mr. John Reginald Yorke, Mr. Dawson-Damer, and Mr. Henry Fenwick; April 27, Mr. Locke and Colonel Knox added
Report of the Committee—(*Parl. P.* No. 399)

Theatres, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Locke, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Denman*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 10, [177] 1529 [Bill 64]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Locke*) *June* 13, [180] 178
Amendt. "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after short debate, Question agreed to; Debate adjourned
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [13th June] read *June* 15
Moved, "That the debate be further adjourned," [180] 332; [House counted out]

THOMPSON, Mr. H. S., *Whitby*
Greenock Railway, Re-Comm. [178] 1199
Malt, Res. [177] 1266
Railway Accidents, Res. [177] 1129
Railway Bills (Group 8), Res. [179] 874, 875
Railways (Guards and Passengers communication), Res. [179] 63
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 322; Comm. Amendt. [179] 131, 370

Timber Duties
Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 10, [177] 1480

"Times" The, and the Budget
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 15, [179] 299

TITE, Mr. W., *Bath*
Dwellings for the Working Classes, [177] 1526
Main Drainage (Metropolis), [177] 205
Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation, 2R. [177] 837
Metropolitan Paving, &c. Commission moved for, [180] 138
Piccadilly and Park Lane New Road, 2R. [177] 591
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1555
Supply—National Gallery Enlargement, [180] 491, 498
Westminster Improvement Commission, Return moved for, [179] 208; Comm. [180] 44

TOLLEMACHE, Mr. J., *Cheshire, S.*
Salt, Importation of, into France, [179] 292
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 315

Took the Oath
Feb 7—The Archbishop of Dublin
Feb 9—The Bishop of Kilmore, &c.
June 19—The Viscount Gort, a Representative Peer for Ireland

Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Hennessy, The O'Donoghue*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 28 [Bill 95]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*The O'Donoghue*) *April* 5, [178] 755; after short debate, agreed to
Read 2° *April* 5
Committee; Report *May* 4, 1521
Considered * *May* 5
Read 3° * *May* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) *May* 9 (No. 96)
Read 2ª after short debate *May* 22, [179] 630
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3ª * *May* 26
Royal Assent *June* 2 [28 *Vict.* c. 33]

TORRENS, Mr. R., *Carrickfergus*
Army Estimates—Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, Adj. moved, [178] 264
Belfast—Riots at, Res. [180] 163
[*cont.*

TORRENS, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 734; Amendt. 739, 742
Commons and Open Spaces, Comm. moved for, [177] 508
India—Expedition to Bhootan, [178] 939
Indian Civil Service Examinations, [179] 295; Papers moved for, 413
Indian Staff Appointments, [177] 1043
Navy—The "Bellerophon," [179] 789
Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [180] 323; 2R. 510
Poor Laws—The Highworth Union, [180] 824
Prisoners in Newgate, Treatment of, [177] 1025
Private Bill Costs, 2R. [177] 567
Private Bills—Printing Petitions, [177] 113, 114, 115; Res. 282, 285
Scotland—Port Patrick Harbour, [178] 783
Sewage of the Metropolis, [177] 1479
Supply—Constabulary (Ireland), [179] 1152

TOWNSHEND, Marquess
Casual Poor—Metropolis, [178] 3
Imprisonment on Civil Process, Middlesex, [178] 2

TRACY, Hon. C. R. D. Hanbury, *Montgomery*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 48
Army—Ordnance Select Committee, [178] 371
Bath, Order of the, Address moved, [180] 400
Navy—Chaplain General, [177] 1006;—Chaplains' Quarterly Report, [178] 488;—Carriage of Treasure, 1316

Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Horsfall; long debate thereon *Mar* 17, [177] 1850

Transport Service between England and India
Observations, Mr. Ayrton; Reply, Mr. T. G Baring *June* 30, [180] 1022

Treason and Felony Bill, Forfeiture for
Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 19, [180] 445

Treasure Trove
Question, Sir Jervoise Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 19, [180] 440

TREFUSIS, Hon. C. H. R., *Devonshire, N.*
Highway Contracts, Stamp Duty on, [180] 446

TREHERNE, Mr. M., *Coventry*
France—Commercial Treaty with, [177] 1748
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 1068

TRELAWNY, Sir J. S., *Tavistock*
Army—The Foot Guards, [178] 86
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1789, 1793, 1796;—Pay and Allowances, Amendt. 1821, 1822;—Martial Law, 1974, 1975;—Disembodied Militia, 1977
New Zealand—Proclamation of the Governor, [177] 1742
Tower, Deputy Lieutenancy of the, [177] 1044

Trespass (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Finlay, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Cumming Bruce*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 98]
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 2
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 12
Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 146)
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3ª * *June* 22
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 56]

Trinity Board—Steam Tugs
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 6, [177] 1117

TROLLOPE, Right Hon. Sir J., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Scotland), [179] 1127
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 95; Comm. 727; *cl.* 1, 730
Supply—Woods, Forests, &c. [179] 708;—Lunacy Commissions, 1136, 1137
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 329; Comm. [179] 342; Consid. 700

Trusts Administration (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24 [Bill 92]
Read 2° * *April* 6
Committee *; Report *April* 27
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 18 [Bill 158]
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *June* 16
Considered as amended * *June* 19
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 22 (No. 185)
Order for Committee discharged * *July* 3

Turkey and Persia—The Boundary Negotiations
Motion for an Address for "Copy of the Treaty concluded at Erzeroum between Turkey and Persia, in October, 1847," and other Papers (*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *Mar* 16, [177] 1727; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

TURNER, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.*
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, Comm. *add. cl.* [180] 683, 684

TURNER, Mr. J. A., *Manchester*
Paper Trade, The, [180] 131
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [178] 1284; Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 537, 539

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir G. Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 16
Read 2° * *June* 20 [Bill 227]
Considered in Committee *June* 22, [180] 687; [House counted out]
Committee; Report *June* 26, [180] 844
Considered as amended * *June* 27
Read 3° * *June* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 28
Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 232)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 107]

Turnpike Tolls Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. McMahon*)
c. Ordered after short debate *May* 4, [178] 1524
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 128]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Whalley*), [180] 592; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn *June* 20

Turnpike Trusts
Question, Mr. Western; Answer Sir George Grey *Feb* 10, [177] 137; Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. T. G. Baring *May* 4, [178] 1409

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill
(*Mr. Baring, Sir G. Grey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 16 [Bill 225]
Read 2° * *June* 20
Committee * *June* 22; Report * *June* 23
Read 3° * *June* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 216)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 91]

Tyne Improvement Bill
l. Petitions presented by The Earl of Ellenborough *June* 27, [180] 848; short debate thereon
Read 3ª *June* 27

Ulster Canal Transfer Bill
(*Mr. Peel, Mr. Luke White*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 13 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *June* 19
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 217)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 109]

Union Chargeability Bill
(*Mr. C. P. Villiers, Sir G. Grey*)

177] *c.* Motion for leave (*Mr. C. P. Villiers*), 468
Ordered; after debate read 1° *Feb* 20
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. C. P. Villiers*) *Mar* 27, 277 [Bill 31]
. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "considering the little knowledge this House possesses as to the practical working of the Irremovable Poor Act of 1861, it is inexpedient, without further information, to legislate on the subject of Union Rating during the present Session" (*Sir Rainald Knightley*), 294; Question, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Knight*), negatived; original Question and Amendt. again proposed; Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 203, N. 131; M. 72; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 356; original Question agreed to; Read 2° *Mar* 27
179] Order for Committee read
. Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, with a view to rendering the working of the system of Union Chargeability more just and equal, that they have power to facilitate in certain cases the alteration of the limits of existing Unions" (*Mr. Bentinck*) *May* 11; after long debate, A. 118, N. 193; M. 75, 116
. Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. C. P. Villiers*), 131
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Thompson*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Rainald Knightley*); after debate, A. 80, N. 174; M. 94; Question again proposed, "That the words, &c."
Amendt. "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Lygon*) negatived; Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Debate adjourned
. Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendt. proposed to Question [11th May]; "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Debate resumed *May* 15, 303; after long debate, A. 266, N. 93; M. 173;—[For Division List, see Appendix]—Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," agreed to; Bill considered in Committee; Committee R.P. 371
. Bill considered in Committee *May* 18, 491; after long debate, Bill reported [Bill 155]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" (*Mr. Villiers*) *May* 22, 663
. Amendt. (*Mr. Knight*), 665; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question agreed to; main Question agreed to
. Bill considered, 700
. Amendts. made; Bill read 3° after long debate *May* 25, 789
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *May* 26
180] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 12, 9
. Amendt. to leave out from ("be,") and insert ("referred to a Select Committee") (*The Duke of Rutland*); Question, "Whether the Bill be referred to a Select Committee;" after long debate, Cont. 24, Not-Cont. 86; M. 62; [*cont.*

Union Chargeability Bill—cont.
180] resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 41; original Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª *June* 12 (No. 122)
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Lord President*) *June* 16, 351; after short debate, Motion agreed to; House in Committee
Report * *June* 19 (No. 171)
. Read 3ª with the Amendments *June* 20, 524; after short debate, Bill passed, and sent to the Commons
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 79]

Union Chargeability Bill
Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 31, [178] 561; Question, Colonel Wilson Patten; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 3, 670; Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *April* 28, 1204

Union of Benefices Act—St. Benet Gracechurch Street, and Allhallows, Lombard Street
Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. E. P. Bouverie *Feb* 17, [177] 321

Union of Benefices Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Edward Pleydell Bouverie, Mr. Goschen*)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. E. P. Bouverie*) *Mar* 9, [177] 1458
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of the Order in Council of the 1st day of November, 1864, for the removal of the Church of St. Benet's, Gracechurch Street:
"And, of all the Correspondence on the subject between the Archdeacon of London and the Members of the Church Estates Commissioners" (*Mr. Hubbard*), 1460; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, A. 21, N. 11; M. 10
Bill ordered after debate *April* 25, [178] 1013
Read 1°* *April* 26 [Bill 115]

Union Officers (Ireland) Superannuation Bill (*Sir R. Peel, Mr. C. P. Villiers*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 7 [Bill 53]
177] Read 2° after debate *Mar* 17, 1907
178] Committee; Report *Mar* 24, 266
Considered * *Mar* 28
Read 3°* *Mar* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 31 (No. 52)
179] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 9, 3
. Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Earl of Donoughmore*); Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 73, Not-Cont. 46; M. 27; List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 5; Bill read 2ª *May* 9
Committee*; Report *May* 11
Read 3ª* *May* 12
Royal Assent *May* 26 [28 *Vict.* c. 26]

UNITED STATES

LORDS—

Assassination of President Lincoln—Notice (*Earl Russell*) *April* 27, [178] 1073; Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to convey to Her Majesty the expression of the deep Sorrow and Indignation with which this House has learned the Assassination of the President of the United States of America, and to pray Her Majesty that in communicating Her own Sentiments on this deplorable Event to the Government of the United States, Her Majesty will also be graciously pleased to express on the Part of this House their Abhorrence of the Crime and their sympathy with the Government and People of the United States" (*Earl Russell*) *May* 1, 1219; after short debate, Motion agreed to, Nemine Dissentiente—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *May* 4, 1451; Debate on the Address; Explanation, The Earl of Derby *May* 4, 1451

Belligerent Rights, Question, Lord Houghton; Answer, Earl Russell *May* 15, [179] 286; Question, The Earl of Derby; Answer, Earl Russell *June* 12, [180] 1

COMMONS—

"Alabama" Claims, The, Question, Sir John Walsh; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 26, [179] 876; Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 30, 1107

Assassination of President Lincoln—Notice (*Sir George Grey*) *April* 27, [178] 1081; Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to convey to Her Majesty the expression of the deep Sorrow and Indignation with which this House has learned the Assassination of the President of the United States of America, and to pray Her Majesty that in communicating Her own Sentiments on this deplorable Event to the Government of the United States, Her Majesty will also be graciously pleased to express on the part of Her faithful Commons their Abhorrence of the Crime, and their sympathy with the Government and People of the United States" (*Sir G. Grey*) *May* 1, 1242; after short debate, Motion agreed to, Nemine Contradicente—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *May* 4, 1471

Belligerent Rights, Question, Mr. J. White; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 15, 296

British Embassy at Washington, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Layard *Feb* 17, [177] 318

British North America, The Red River Territory, Question, Sir Edward Grogan; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 29, [179] 976

Canada and the United States, Treaties between, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 10, "Address for Papers and Correspondence relating to the notice given by the Government of the United States of North America to terminate the Convention under which England and the United States mutually agreed [*cont.*

UNITED STATES—COMMONS—*cont.*

not to fit out Naval Armaments upon the Canadian Lakes; also respecting the abrogation of the Treaty of Commerce between the Provinces of British North America and the United States by the late Lord Elgin" (*Sir John Walsh*), [177] 141; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 17, "Motion for Copies of all Papers in the possession of Her Majesty's Government, respecting the 'Reciprocity Treaty,' and the 'Bonding Act,' of dates subsequent to December, 1861" (*Mr. Watkin*), 410; Amendt. withdrawn

Canada, Fortifications in, Question, Mr. B. Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 11, [179] 114—*Parl. Paper*—Captain Jervois' Letter [3434]

Canadian Delegates, The, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *June* 2, [179] 1209 — *Parl. Paper* — The Conferences [3535]

Civil War, Close of the, Copy of Papers laid on the Table *July* 4, [180] 1143

Claims for Compensation, Questions, Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Bright; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 9, [177] 1372

Extradition Treaty, The, Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 13, [177] 1537

Passport System, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *Feb* 24, [177] 660

Proclamation of President Johnson, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Viscount Palmerston *May* 19, [179] 563

"Saxon," Case of the—Mrs. Gray, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 13, [180] 131

The Confederate States—

Beale, Captain, Case of, Question, Mr. Peacocke; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 13, [177] 1536

British Property in the, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 20, [177] 1922

Confederate States Cruisers, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Layard *Mar* 3, [177] 1044

Consuls for the Southern States, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Layard *June* 16, [180] 367

Parl Papers—

North America, 1865—
Correspondence respecting
No. 1 Attack on St. Albans . . . [3427]
No. 2 Reciprocity Treaty . . . . [3470]
No. 3 The "Kearsarge" and "Alabama" . . . . . . [3511]
No. 4 Consular Exequators . . . [3512]
No. 5 Assassination of President Lincoln . . . . [3528]
No. 6 Cessation of Civil War . . . [3538]
No. 7 Proclamation of President Johnson . . . . [3539]
No. 8 Compensation to Widow of Mr. Gray . . . . [3545]
No. 9 Cessation of Civil War—Further Paper . . . . . . [3572]
No. 10 Do. Do. [3577]

University of London
Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Mar* 10, [177] 1478; Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Mr. Cowper *June* 2, [179] 1209

University of Oxford, Election for the
Question, Sir Robert Clifton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 9, [179] 50

Upper Street, Islington, State of
Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Sir George Grey *May* 12, [179] 238

Utilization of Sewage and Land Reclamation (Ireland) Bill
c. Moved, "That these Bills be referred to the Select Committee on the Metropolis Sewage and Essex Reclamation Bill" (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn *Mar* 21, [178] 6
Bill withdrawn* *May* 11

Vacant Inspectorship of Charities
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. H. A. Bruce *June* 15, [180] 263

VANCE, Mr. J., *Dublin City*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Res. [179] 570
Bank Notes (Ireland), 2R. [180] 607
Clonpriest, &c. Benefices (Ireland), Returns moved for, [177] 249
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [180] 836
Court of Chancery (Ireland), [178] 894
Fire Brigade (Metropolis), 2R. [179] 837, 839
Ireland—Constabulary Clothing, [177] 206;—Royal Hibernian Military School, Returns moved for, [178] 542
Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 599
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. Adj. moved, [179] 611, 617
Secret Service Money, Returns moved for, [180] 591
Secretary of State for War, Res. [180] 453
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [179] 1301

VANDELEUR, Colonel C. M., *Clare Co.*
Casey, Alexander, Property of the late, [178] 370
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 608

VANE, Earl
Johnson, Colonel, Case of, [178] 1531

VANSITTART, Mr. W., *Windsor*
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1694, 1695
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), [178] 1518
East India (Governor General's Powers, &c.), Comm. [178] 456
[*cont.*

VANSITTART, Mr. W.—*cont.*
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 949
India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 861, 863
India—Sanitary State of Calcutta, [177] 238;—Native Artillery, 1118;—Expedition to Bhootan, [178] 938, 944;—Civil Service Examinations, Papers moved for, [179] 418;—Case of Mr. Buckle, 561;—Finances of, [180] 731
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1302
Roman Catholic Oath, Comm. [179] 614
Ways and Means, Comm. Res.—Fire Insurance, [178] 1511

VERNER, Mr. E. W., *Lisburn*
Belfast—Riots at, Res. [180] 160
Ireland—Dinner to Mr. Gavan Duffy, [180] 1041
Lotteries—Public Departments, [179] 1268

VERNEY, Sir H., *Buckingham*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1794;—Pay and Allowances, 1822, 1959;—Martial Law, 1975;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 245;—Administration of the Army, 976
Army—Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 526
India—Officers serving in, [178] 792
Navy—Chaplain General, [177] 1003
Poland—Affairs of, Res. [177] 1838
Schleswig-Holstein Duchies, [177] 749; [178] 925
Supply — Royal Parks, [179] 242; — British Museum, 1353
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 234
Union Chargeability, Consid. [179] 686

VILLIERS, Right Hon. C. P. (Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board), *Wolverhampton*
Agricultural Parishes, Returns moved for, [177] 830, 831, 1202
Green, Mary, Case of, [178] 1082
Greenwich Union—Cases of Mary Moriarty and others, [177] 597
Irish Paupers, Removal of, [177] 84
Medical Officers of Poor Law Unions, [177] 235
Metropolitan Houseless Poor, Leave, [177] 2001; 2R. [178] 533, 539; Comm. *cl.* 1, 758, 766; *add. cl.* 759, 763, 764, 765; Consid. 860
Metropolitan Workhouses, Dietary of, [179] 299
Mines and Timber, Rating of, [177] 659
Night Refuges (Metropolis), [177] 1920
Parochial Medical Relief, [178] 568
Poor Law Board Continuance, 2R. [180] 89, 100, 102, 103, 104; Comm. 721; *cl.* 1, 729, 730
Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 459
Poor Law Unions, [177] 1116;—Auditors of Accounts, [178] 1203
[*cont.*

VILLIERS, Right Hon. C. P.—*cont.*
Union Chargeability, Leave, [177] 468; 2R. [178] 277, 355, 561, 671, 1204; Comm. [179] 116, 125, 127, 142, 170, 172, 352, 364; *cl.* 1, 491, 492; *cl.* 2, 503, 516; *add. cl.* 518; *cl.* 5, 519; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 519; *add. cl.* 520, 522, 524; Consid. 687, 692; *add. cl.* 700, 701, 702; 3R. 795
Workhouse Nurses, [178] 1534
Wycombe, High, Poor Law Union, [178] 82; Papers moved for, [179] 227

VIVIAN, Lord
Metalliferous Mines, 2R. [179] 625
Mines, Report on, [179] 387

VIVIAN, Mr. H. H., *Glamorganshire*
Army—Conversion of Enfield Rifles, [179] 388;—Military Chaplains in New Zealand, 1225
Leeds Bankruptcy Court, Res. [180] 1119

Wakefield Gaol
Observations, Mr. Neate; debate thereon *Mar* 3, [177] 1087

WALCOTT, Admiral J. E., *Christchurch*
Argentine Republic—Treatment of a British Officer, [180] 540
Greenwich Hospital, Leave, [178] 1013; 2R. [179] 1008, 1012; Comm. *cl.* 11, 1325; *cl.* 20, [180] 127; *cl.* 51, 128; *add. cl.* 129
Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, Res. [180] 397
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1387;—Half Pay, [178] 998
Navy—Widows of Warrant Officers, Res. [179] 580

WALPOLE, Right Hon. S. H., *Cambridge University*
Army—Case of Lieut.-Colonel Dawkins, [179] 661
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1813, 1815
Bishops' Trusts Substitution Act, [180] 445
British Museum, [177] 1534
Cartoons at Hampton Court Palace, [179] 301
Church Establishment (Ireland), [178] 1204
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 852
Clerical Subscription, Comm. *cl.* 1, [180] 839; *cl.* 2, 840
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [178] 524
Courts of Justice Building, 2R. [177] 295, 298
Ecclesiastical Leasing Act Amendment, 2R. [179] 260
Greenwich Hospital, Comm. *cl.* 10, [179] 1320; *cl.* 11, 1324
Inland Revenue, Comm. Res. 1, [179] 712; Res. 2, 713
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 625
Liverpool Licensing, 2R. [177] 654
Minor Canons, &c. [180] 988
Railway Legislation, [177] 234
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 465, 469; Comm. 616
Science and Art Collections, [178] 1551
[*cont.*

WALPOLE, Right Hon. S. H.—*cont.*
Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [178] 852;—British Historical Portrait Gallery, [179] 1276;—British Museum, 1348, 1357
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Leave, [178] 49
Thames and Isis Navigation, [178] 231

WALSH, Sir J. B., *Radnorshire*
Canada and the United States, Papers moved for, [177] 141
United States—The "Alabama" claims, [179] 876

WALTER, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
County Voters Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 103
Courts of Justice, New, Site, [177] 208
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 858
Educational and Charitable Institutions, 2R. [180] 611
Law of Evidence, Comm. *cl.* 2, [180] 318
Prisons, Leave, [177] 219; 2R. 1362
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 338

War Department Tramway (Devon) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Earl de Grey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 15 (No. 104)
Read 2ª * *May* 23
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Committee * *May* 29; Report * *May* 30
Read 3ª * *June* 1
c. Read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 204]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 23
Royal Assent *June* 29 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 74]

WARNER, Mr. E., *Norwich*
Abyssinia—British Prisoners in, [178] 957
Canadian Delegates, The, [179] 1209
Cape Colony—The Kaffirs, [179] 976
Colonial Defences, [179] 1105
Great Yarmouth Borough, Haven and Port, 2R. Amendt. [177] 744
Locomotives on Roads, Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 1064
Soulage Collection, Papers moved for, [180] 412
Union Chargeability, 2R. [178] 335; Comm. *cl.* 2, [179] 518

Warrant Officers
Question, The Earl of Hardwicke; Answer, The Duke of Somerset *June* 30, [180] 980
Widows of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "the cruel exception which deprives those Widows of Warrant Officers of the Navy who became Widows prior to 1860 of any Pension is not approved by this House" (*Sir John Hay*), [179] 577; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, A. 62, N. 42; M. 20

WATERHOUSE, Major S., *Pontefract*
Bank Notes Issue, Re-Comm. *cl.* 8, [179] 826

Waterworks Bill (*Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Baring*)
c. Ordered * *April* 7
Read 1° * *April* 24 [Bill 112]
Read 2° * *May* 1
Referred to Select Committee *May* 1
And, on May 11, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Roebuck (Chairman), Mr. Scholefield, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. W. E. Forster, Sir John Ogilvy, Sir E. Grogan, Mr. Caird, Mr. Smollett, Lord R. Grosvenor, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Beecroft, Mr. John Tollemache, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Milner Gibson; May 12, Mr. Dawson-Damer added
Special Report * *June* 23 (No. 401)

Waterworks Bill
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Mar* 3, [177] 1042

Waterworks Reservoirs
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer Sir George Grey *Feb* 23, [177] 600; Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Sir George Grey *Mar* 21, [178] 7

WATKIN, Mr. E. W., *Stockport*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [177] 1811;—Manufacturing Departments, 1990, 1992;—Works, Buildings, &c. [178] 129;—Military Education, 262;—Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 264
British Embassy at Washington, [177] 318
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1598
Courts of Justice Concentration (Site), Instruction to Comm. [177] 930
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Roach River Fishery, 2R. [179] 1263
Rupert's Land, [178] 1601
Supply—British Museum, [179] 1353
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 329
United States—The Reciprocity Treaty, Papers moved for, [177] 410;—Passport System, 660
Volunteer Officers, [177] 1662

WAYS AND MEANS
Considered in Committee *Mar* 13, [177] 1643, £175,650, Consolidated Fund
Resolution reported * *Mar* 14

178] Considered in Committee; *The Financial Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer April* 27, 1084
Motion, "That towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty in lieu of the Duties of Customs now charged on Tea, the following Duties of Customs shall, on and after the 6th day of May 1865 until the 1st day of August 1866, be charged thereon on importation into Great Britain and Ireland: viz.—

		£	s.	d.
Tea - - -	the lb.	0	0	6"

Considered in Committee *May* 4
Question again proposed
Amendt. to leave out "6th day of May," and insert "1st day of June" (*Mr. Moffatt*), 1471; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Ways and Means—cont.
178] Another Amendt. to leave out "on and after the 6th day of May, 1865" (*Mr. Moffatt*); Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived
Another Amendt. to add, "Provided, That, on special grounds, the said reduction shall not take effect until the 1st day of June, 1865" (*Mr. Moffatt*); Question, "That the words, &c.," agreed to; original Question, as amended, agreed to
Income and Property Tax—Resolution, 1502
Fire Insurance Duty—Resolution, 1503
Amendt. to leave out "25th day of June," and insert "15th day of May" (*Sir James Fergusson*); after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," agreed to; original Question agreed to
Resolutions reported *May* 5
Considered in Committee; £1,000,000 Exchequer Bonds *May* 5, 1570
Resolutions reported; Bill ordered *May* 8

180] Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented 8th June] referred *June* 20

Considered in Committee *June* 20
1. *Resolved*, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there be issued and applied to the service of the year ending the 31st day of March, 1866, the sum of £1,318,526 16*s*. 9*d*., being the Surplus of Ways and Means granted for the service of the preceding years
2. That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the sum of £23,342,558 3*s*. 3*d*., be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland

Resolutions reported *June* 21

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

SCHEDULE OF WAYS AND MEANS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 10 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) ACT—VIZ.:

1864-5	£	s.	d.
Amount granted per Act 28 *Vict*. c. 4, for the service of the year ending 31 March 1865	175,650	0	0
1865-6			
Amount granted for the service of the year ending 31 March 1866—viz.:			
Per Act 28 *Vict*. c. 10 ...	15,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of the Act	23,342,558	3	3
Per Section 9 of the Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the service of preceding years)	1,318,526	16	9
TOTAL GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS to meet the following Supplies:— 1864–5 £175,650 1865–6 39,661,085	£39,836,735	0	0

WEGUELIN, Mr. T. M., *Wolverhampton*
Partnership Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [179] 536

Wellington's, Duke of, Monument at St. Paul's
Question, Sir M. Farquhar; Answer, Mr Cowper *Mar* 23, [178] 80

WENSLEYDALE, Lord
Partnership Amendment, 2R. [180] 118; Report, Amendt. 709

WESTBURY, Lord—*see* CHANCELLOR, The Lord

Western Africa—The War at Lagos
Question, Lord Stanley; Answer, Mr. Cardwell *May* 16, [179] 389

WESTERN, Mr. T. SUTTON-, *Maldon*
New Zealand—War in, [178] 893
Registration of County Voters, [177] 1475
Turnpike Trusts, [177] 137

West India and Pacific Steamship Company's Mail Contracts
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Peel *Mar* 20, [177] 1921

West Indies Postage Rates
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Peel *June* 12, [180] 46

WESTMEATH, Marquess of
Confession in the Church of England—Law of Evidence, [179] 177, 182, 188; [180] 334, 347
Divine Worship in the Church of England, 1R. [180] 762; 2R. 918, 919
Hymn Book for the Army and Navy, [180] 859, 861
Ireland—Case of Catherine Gaughan, Papers moved or, [178] 268; [179] 723, 1186; [180] 1158, 1159
Juries (Ireland), 1R. [178] 629; 2R. 1595, 1597
Liverpool Borough Prison, [180] 859
Railway Passengers, [180] 436
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [180] 821
Roman Catholic Schools, [180] 859
Ryan, Mary, Case of, [177] 1646

Westminster Bridge (Metropolis)
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Cowper *Feb* 13, [177] 208

Westminster Charities, Cities of London and
Moved, "That the Digest of the Parochial Charities of the Cities of London and Westminster, referred to in the Eleventh and Twelfth Reports of the Charity Commissioners, be laid before the House" (*The Bishop of London*) *June* 23, [180] 705; after short debate, Motion agreed to—*Parl. P.* No. [3461]

Westminster Improvement Commission
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, Returns relative to the expenditure and working of the Westminster Improvement Commission" (*Sir William Gallwey*), [179] 206; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Westminster Improvements Bill [Lords] (by Order)
c. Read 2°; Moved, "That the Bill be committed" *June* 12, [180] 43
Amendt. to add "to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*); Question, "That those words be there added," 44; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Ordered, that the Bill be committed

Westminster Palace Crypt
Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Cowper *May* 4, [178] 1468

WHALLEY, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Army—Recruiting, Commission moved for, [177] 533;—Libraries, &c. Papers moved for, [178] 47
Belfast—Riots at, Res. [180] 162
Chelsea Bridge Toll Abolition, 2R. [178] 1303
Church of England Usages, Comm. moved for, [179] 774
Church Rates Commutation, 2R. [179] 93
Dogs Regulation (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [179] 482
Established Church Service — Rev. A. D. Wagner, Comm. moved for, [179] 767, 770, 773
Education, Comm. moved for, [177] 923
Financial Statement—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1144
Ireland—Royal Hibernian Military School, Returns moved for, Adj. moved, [178] 542
Kent, Constance, Case of, [179] 48
Metropolitan Police Rate, [177] 1904, 1905
Monastic and Conventual Establishments, Comm. moved for, [177] 1064, 1071
Police Superannuation, Comm. *add. cl.* [178] 1073
Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1168
Railway Construction Facilities Act Amendment, 2R. [180] 593
Roman Catholic Oath, Leave, [178] 34; 2R. [179] 436, 437; Comm. 615, 618; Adj. moved, 619; 3R. [180] 328
Supply—Rates for Government Property, [179] 602;—Houses of Parliament, 605;—Foreign Office, 607;—Board of Trade, 610
Tories, Robbers, and Rapparees (Ireland), Comm. [178] 1523
Turnpike Tolls Abolition, Leave, [178] 1524; 2R. [180] 592
Union Chargeability, Comm. [179] 335

WHARNCLIFFE, Lord
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 439
North West Territory—British North America, [177] 583

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Navy—Board of Admiralty, [178] 687
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1455

White, Mr. J., *Brighton*
African Merchant's Company, Subsidy to, [177] 747
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic—Forged Signatures, Report, [177] 1737
Bank Notes Issue, 2R. [177] 613
Brazil—Diplomatic Relations with, [177] 1369
Canada—Defences of—Colonel Jervois' Report, [177] 1587
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 737
Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions), 3R. [180] 842
Confederate States, Belligerent Rights of the, [179] 296
Financial Statement, [177] 1534;—Ways and Means, Comm. Res. [178] 1128
Foreign Statistics, [177] 958
France—Commercial Treaty with, [177] 1752
Malt, Res. [177] 1257
Mileage Duty on Stage Carriages, [180] 261
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [178] 368
Poor Law Board Continuance, Comm. [180] 721
State Papers, [178] 791
Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1143;—Department of Science and Art, 1176;—Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, 1277;—Captured Negroes, 1281;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1302;— Fishery Board (Scotland), 1306;—Post Office Packet Service, [180] 471
Taxes in Europe, [177] 958
Trade with Foreign Nations, Select Committee on, [177] 1865

Whiteside, Rt. Hon. J., *Dublin University*
Belfast, Riots at, [177] 354, 361, 378, 382
Church Establishment (Ireland), Res. [178] 435
Clerical Subscription, 2R. [180] 638, 653
Convocation—Alteration of the Canons, [179] 1269; [180] 369
County Courts Equitable Jurisdiction, 2R. [179] 858
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [178] 509, 512; [179] 1269
Court of Chancery (Ireland) (No. 2), Leave, [177] 307; 2R. 1027
Ireland—Medical Officers in Unions, Res. [177] 1522;—Royal Hibernian Military School, Returns moved for, [178] 542;—Railway System, 673; Address moved, 905;—The Fenian Brotherhood, 890;—The Constabulary, [179] 1339
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), Law of, Comm. moved for, [178] 624
Patent Office—Alleged Irregularities in the, [177] 1123
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1306
Record of Title (Ireland), 2R. [179] 844, 849, 853; Comm. 1181; *cl.* 6, Amendt. [180] 87; *add. cl.* 330, 331
Roman Catholic Oath, 2R. [179] 442, 443, 446, 451, 461, 471; Comm. 612, 618, 619, 620, 1085, 1086; *cl.* 1, [180] 68, 69; 3R. 328
[*cont.*

Whiteside, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
Supply—Education (Ireland), [179] 1255, 1258;—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, 1300
University Education (Ireland), Address moved, [180] 555, 556, 565, 568, 584

Wick and Ayr Burghs Election Bill
(*Mr. Edward Craufurd, Viscount Bury*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 166]
Read 2° * *June* 1
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Considered as amended * *June* 19
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 27 (No. 186)
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 30
Royal Assent *July* 5 [28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 92]

Wicklow, Earl of
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of—Pension, Res. [179] 23
Patent Office Accounts, Audit of the, [179] 260

Williamson, Sir H., *Durham, N.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 40

Willoughby, Sir H. P., *Evesham*
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic—Forged Signatures, Report, [177] 1737
Bank of Ireland, 2R. [177] 453
Banks of Issue, Res. [177] 154
Courts of Justice Building, Leave, [177] 177; Comm. Amendt. 601, 605, 607
Guns for Coast Defences, [177] 1931
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [177] 1431
New Zealand, [177] 1745
Poor Law Secretary, Res. [177] 468
Public Accounts, Committee nominated, [177] 455
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1303
Supply—Redemption of the Scheldt Toll, [177] 1456

Wimbledon Common Bill
c. After Statement (*Viscount Bury*), Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 21st March *Feb* 21, [177] 498
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Viscount Bury*) *April* 6, [178] 769
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Cox*), 776; Question, "That 'now,' &c.," agreed to; Read 2° *April* 6

Winchester, Bishop of
Clerical Subscription, Report, *add. cl.* [179] 1050

Winnington, Sir T. E., *Bewdley*
Railway Bills (Group 8), Res. [179] 875

Winslow's, Mr., Pension
Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 3, [180] 1040; Personal Explanation, Lord Chelmsford *July* 4, 1139

Wood, Right Hon. Sir C. (Secretary of State for India), *Halifax*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [177] 81
Azeem Jah, Nawab of the Carnatic, Comm. moved for, [177] 1708
Bank Notes Issue, Comm. [178] 1262
Civil Service Estimates, [178] 738
County Voters Registration (Ireland), 2R. [178] 266
East India (Governor General's Powers, &c.), Comm. [178] 456
East India (Revenue Accounts), Comm. [180] 927, 960
Government of India Act, [179] 585
India — Talookdars and Cultivators of Oude, [177] 138;—Affairs of, 1831;—Land Tenures of, [179] 114; [180] 447;—District Judges, [177] 204;—Affairs of Bhootan, 207;—Expedition to, [178] 781, 941, 944; [179] 1120;—Moorings at Calcutta, [177] 207;—Central Indian Prize Money, 209;—Sanitary State of Calcutta, 238; — Kirwee Prize Money, 289;—Disinfecting Powder for, 450;—Madras Irrigation Company, 598;—Navigation of the Godavery, 658;—Native Artillery, 1118;—Bombay Back Bay Shares, 1951, 1953;—Labour Ordinance, [178] 239, 240; —Lucknow Prize Money, 371, 1602; [180] 730;—Pegu Prize Money, [178] 784; Explanation, 959;—Officers serving in, 792;—The Budget, 891, 892; [179] 1120; [180] 260, 261;—The Sixty-fourth Foot, [178] 1240;—Export Duties, 1600;—The Loan, 1601; — Irrigation Works, [179] 50; — Transport of Troops to, 115, 116;—Delhi Prize Money, 193;—Staff promotion in the Indian Army, 297;—Indian Medal, 302, 563; —Case of Mr. Buckle, 561;—Mortality in the Royal Artillery on the march from Mhow to Kirkee, 1120;—Army promotion, [180] 260;—Dhar Prize Money, 442;—Finances of, 731;—Medical Officers, 924
India Office (Site, &c.), Comm. *cl.* 2, [178] 862, 863
Indian Civil Service Examinations, [179] 295; Papers moved for, 413
Indian Officers, Address moved, [178] 1327, 1329;—Grievances of, [180] 926
Lahore Bishopric, [180] 447
Public Offices (Site and Approaches), Leave, [177] 1302, 1307
Singapore—Transfer of, [179] 389

Works, Office of
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Office of Works, and the Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues" (*Mr. Augustus Smith*); after debate, Question negatived *Mar* 21, [177] 8

Wrecks and Casualties, Abstract of
Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 16, [177] 287

Wrecks on the Coast of Devon and Cornwall
Question, Mr. Kekewich; Answer, Mr. Milner Gibson *Feb* 21, [177] 499

Wrightson, Mr. W. B., *Northallerton*
Prisons, Comm. Schedule 1, [179] 1334

Writs Registration (Scotland) Bill
(*Lord Advocate, Sir G. Grey, Sir W. Dunbar*)
177] *c.* Ordered *Feb* 23, 633
Presented; read 1° * *Feb* 24 [Bill 41]
178] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 27, 1156
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. E. Craufurd*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *May* 5, 1571; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Read 2° *May* 5
179] Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 2, 1188
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Dunlop*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
After debate, Order for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment on going into Committee [2nd June] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn *June* 9, 1337

Writs Registration, &c. (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Dunlop, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Buchanan*)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Dunlop*), [177] 951
Ordered; after debate read 1° *Mar* 1
Bill withdrawn * *June* 12 [Bill 48]

Wrottesley, Lord
Public Schools, Nomination of Comm. [178] 1460

Wycombe Poor Law Union
Question, Mr. Ferrand; Answer, Mr. C. P. Villiers *Mar* 23, [178] 82
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, a Copy of a Letter from the Poor Law Board, dated the 4th day of March, 1865, and signed by Henry Fleming, secretary, relative to the Wycombe Union" (*Mr. Disraeli*), [179] 216; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Wyld, Mr. J., *Bodmin*
Exeter, Diocese of, [178] 931
Fire Insurance, Duty, [178] 1467
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [178] 368
Supply—New Houses of Parliament, [179] 252; —Department of Science and Art, 1173;—Miscellaneous Expenses, 1313

WYNDHAM, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [177] 1957
Railway Accidents, Papers moved for, [180] 1168
Supply—Printing and Stationery, [179] 1143

WYNFORD, Lord
Edmunds, Leonard, Resignation of, Petition, [179] 39

WYNN, Mr. C. W. W., *Montgomeryshire*
County Voters Registration, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [179] 98; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 99, 100

YORK, Archbishop of
Clerical Subscription, Comm. [179] 962; Report, 1046
Companies Workmens' Education, 2R. [179] 483; Comm. 718; *cl.* 1, 954; 3R. 1045

YORKE, Mr. J. R., *Tewkesbury*
Army—Drill Instructors to Volunteers, [178] 671
Levi, Dr. Leone—"Annals of British Legislation," [179] 392
Parliamentary Papers, Digest of, Comm. moved for, [178] 218

Zollverein, The
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Layard *May* 5, [178] 1535; Observations, Mr. Hubbard; Reply, Mr. Milner Gibson *June* 19, [180] 461

END OF VOLUME CLXXX., AND FOURTH AND LAST VOLUME OF SESSION 1865.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

K 26 FEB 1970